IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 2-029 / 91-646

FILED
FEB 25 1992
CLERK SUPREME COURT

93

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF DEBORAH ANN BOWMAN AND CRAIG STEFFEN BOWMAN

Upon the Petition of

DEBORAH ANN BOWMAN,

Petitioner-Appellee/Cross-Appellant,

And Concerning

CRAIG STEFFEN BOWMAN,

Respondent-Appellant/Cross-Appellee.

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Dubuque County, James C. Bauch, Judge.

The parties appeal the district court's decree in their dissolution of marriage. **AFFIRMED.**

David A. Lemanski, Dubuque, for appellant.

Dirk J. Hamel and Robert E. Sabers of Norman, Gilloon & Wright, Dubuque, for appellee.

Heard by Oxberger, C.J., and Hayden and Habhab, JJ.

PER CURIAM

Craig and Deborah Bowman were married in April 1977. Two children were born of the marriage, Tracy in 1978 and Tammy in 1981. The parties agreed that Deborah would maintain physical care of the children with reasonable visitation to Craig.

Deborah, born in 1958, is a high school graduate with one-half year of nursing school. She is in good health and works at Target as a supervisor. She earns around $19,000 per year. Deborah also receives social security benefits for the children. At the time of the marriage, she had few assets.

Craig, born in 1953, began working for John Deere in 1972. In 1973, Craig lost a leg in a motorcycle accident. Craig received a settlement arising out of the accident of around $14,000. Craig also receives monthly social security and John Deere disability payments. In 1975, Craig purchased a home. Craig and Deborah were engaged at the time.

In February 1990, Deborah filed a petition for dissolution of marriage. The case eventually proceeded to trial. At trial, Craig sought to have the home and his accident settlement considered premarital assets. Craig also sought to establish that a recent $24,000 payment to his mother was for prior loans. Deborah filed a motion for rule 80 sanctions based on Craig's alleged fraudulent conveyance of the $24,000.

Following trial, the district court entered its findings and decree. The court determined that it would not separate out any premarital assets. The court then awarded Deborah the house and accompanying mortgage, her retirement, and a car. Craig was awarded his retirement, a car, and the nearly $24,000 mutual fund. The court found that Craig's $24,000 conveyance to his mother was fraudulent. Both parties were to pay their attorney fees. In a posttrial ruling, the court required Craig, as a rule 80 sanction, to pay for and provide Deborah an abstract of title for the house. Following these rulings, Craig appealed and Deborah cross-appealed.

Deborah also seeks attorney fees to pursue this appeal.

Our review of this dissolution action is de novo. Iowa R. App. P. 4.

We have reviewed the facts and the district court decree. In our de novo review, we concur in the results reached. We affirm the trial court on all issues.

Each party will pay his or her own attorney fees on appeal. Costs of appeal are taxed equally between the parties.

AFFIRMED.