

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION I

No. CV-14-1096

JEANNIE SHERMAN

APPELLANT

V.

RAYMOND BOECKMANN

APPELLEE

Opinion Delivered October 16, 2015

APPEAL FROM THE CROSS
COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT
[NO. 19-DR-12-81-4]

HONORABLE KATHLEEN BELL,
JUDGE

SUBSTITUTED OPINION

SUPPLEMENTATION ORDERED

BRANDON J. HARRISON, Judge

Jeannie Sherman and Raymond Boeckmann were divorced by order of the Cross County Circuit Court in September 2013. Sherman appeals from the circuit court's order finding her in contempt for misuse of marital funds. Due to briefing deficiencies, we order supplementation of the abstract and addendum.¹

This appeal concerns multiple hearings and petitions for contempt filed by Boeckmann. We note that one hearing in particular, conducted on 25 November 2013, has not been abstracted, and two of Boeckmann's contempt petitions, filed 29 October 2013 and 20 November 2013, are not included in the addendum. We also note that the transcript

¹This case was originally handed down in a combined opinion with CV-14-353. We are now issuing two separate opinions for CV-14-353 and CV-14-1096.

for the November 25 hearing and these two petitions are not included in the record; however, both the November 25 hearing transcript and the petitions have been tendered to this court by motion.² Under these unique circumstances, we hereby deem the record in CV-14-1096 supplemented with both the November 25 transcript and the October 25 and November 20 petitions for contempt. With the record now supplemented, we order Sherman to provide this court with a supplemental abstract of the November 25 hearing and a supplemental addendum that includes the two petitions within fifteen days of this opinion pursuant to Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(b)(3). Boeckmann will then have the opportunity to revise or supplement his brief. Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(b)(3).

Supplementation ordered.

ABRAMSON and BROWN, JJ., agree.

²The November 25 hearing transcript was tendered to this court on 27 August 2014, under case number CV-14-393; the contempt petitions were tendered to this court on 25 February 2015 under case number CV-14-1096. The court denied the motions previously. That was a mistake, as they should have been granted. The court apologizes for any inconvenience to the parties related to those denials.