1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Kevin S. Brown Erin E. Harris PAOLI & BROWN, P.C. 116 West Callender St. Livingston, MT 59047 406-222-4420 Fax: 406-222-1032 kevin@paolibrown.com erin@paolibrown.com Attorneys for Petitioner/Appellee	Bowe: clerk of sta Case Nu	LED /05/2025 n Greenwood the supreme court e of montana mber: DA 25-0137
9	SUPREME COURT OF TH		
10	IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF:	Supreme Court Cause No.: DA 25-0137	
11	WILLIAM D. JUHNKE,		
12 13	Petitioner/Appellee,	Sixth Judicial District Court Cause No. DR 34- 2023-18 (Hon. Michael B. Hayworth)	
14	and		
15	DEBORAH WHITE JUHNKE,	MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL	
16	Respondent/Appellant, and		
17	GEORGE "RUSTY" JUHNKE,		
18 19	Intervenor.		
20			
21	Detitioner and Accelles William D ("D	(1)") Juhnka ragnastfully requests that the Court	
22		ill") Juhnke respectfully requests that the Court	
23	dismiss the pending appeal filed by Respondent a	and Appellant Deborah White ("Debbie") Juhnke	
24	due to its prematurity, as follows:		
25	Factual Ba	ackground	
26	Debbie appeals from <i>Findings of Fact</i> , C	Conclusions of Law, and Final Decree entered by	
27	the Sixth Judicial District Court, Hon. Michael B		
28		. may worth, on January 5, 2025. Numerous post	

MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL - 1

trial motions followed. Debbie filed her *Notice of Appeal* on February 14, 2025. At this time, the majority of the pending motions had yet to be ruled upon. These include:

1) CR 239, Debbie's January 13, 2025 Notice of Objection, Notice of Intent to Sell Items, and Request for Clarification

In this pleading, Debbie seeks amendment of the district court's award of a 1956 Buick Special to Bill. Debbie indicates she wants the vehicle distributed to her but does not want to be required to cash Bill out of half its value. Debbie seeks clarification as to her rights and duties visà-vis the parties' rental property, which was awarded to Bill but in which she was granted a life estate. She requests "the right to use of water and power" for the rental "as has been traditional." CR 239 at 2.

Debbie also objects to Bill's stated intention to exercise the option of selling certain items of personal property awarded to him. She argues that these items are the rightful property of the parties' son, Intervenor George "Rusty" Juhnke; indicates that these items will be the subject of an upcoming appeal; and argues that Bill should be prevented from disposing of them. Debbie argues that truck parts awarded to her by the district court are not actually in her possession. She also argues that the washer and dryer awarded to her are no longer in working order. Finally, she asks for an extension of time to make ordered equalization payments to Bill.

In Bill's January 27, 2025 *Response* (CR 244), Bill describes the potential problems caused by Debbie being granted a life estate in his rental property¹ and proposes an alternate arrangement. Bill also opposes Debbie's request to be exempted from paying an equalization payment for the Buick; questions Debbie's standing to object to Bill being awarded items she believes actually

MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL - 2

¹ Including the existence of a no-contact order between the two; the potential for conflict and further litigation; and the fact that it would make it unduly difficult for him to sell the property.

belong to Rusty; and notes that Debbie has not actually moved to stay the execution of the judgment (or taken any steps to obtain a supersedeas bond). Further, Bill also notes that Debbie only provided a receipt for a new washer, not a new dryer, and that it is unclear whether she is still wishes to sell these "unrepairable" appliances or if she is asking the district court to amend its ruling such that she may keep them without making an equalization payment. Finally, Bill opposes Debbie's extension request.

2) CR 247, Debbie's January 20, 2025 *Motion to Compel Petitioner to Complete and* Submit VA Forms

In this pleading, Debbie asserts that Bill (who is a disabled veteran), "unlawfully continues to claim [her] as a dependent and deny her a share of. . .VA payments that may be owed to her[.]" CR 247 at 1. Debbie asks the Court to compel Bill to complete an authorization allowing the VA to disclose Bill's information to her, as well as a "Mandatory Verification of Dependents" form.

In his February 13, 2025 *Response* (CR 252), Bill notes that there is no reason to fill out the forms in question, as he has already informed the VA that he and Debbie are divorced. Further, Bill notes that the district court did not award Debbie any of his VA benefits and that she is not otherwise entitled to any portion thereof. Finally, Bill points out that Debbie attempts to compel his compliance using Rule 37, M. R. Civ. P., which governs discovery, not post-trial practice.

3) CR 242, Debbie's January 22, 2025 Notice of Intent to Sell or Request for Rule 60 Ruling and Motion to Clarify and Request for Order

In this pleading, Debbie asks the district court to amend the value of a safe awarded to her and asserts that, if it does not, she wishes to exercise the option to sell the safe.

Debbie objects to an equalization payment she has been ordered to make to Bill as a result of her unreasonable dissipation of marital funds. Debbie claims that the district court made a

mathematical error in calculating the amount owed and that the payment requirement is at odds with the court's other factual findings and with evidence presented at trial. She also claims that she is financially unable to make the payment.

Debbie objects to being required to pay costs associated with partition of the marital real property, arguing that "the *Final Decree* contradicted [an earlier] order" regarding the allocation of these costs.

Finally, Debbie notifies the Court of an upcoming insurance check for damage to Buick she is requesting. Debbie asks for an order requiring both parties to sign the check over to a local auto body shop. She again requests that the Court issue an amended ruling distributing the vehicle to her and either reducing or eliminating entirely any equalization payable to Bill. She also argues that the court incorrectly valued the vehicle, claiming that its insurance value is less than the value assigned by the court.

In Bill's February 5, 2025 *Response* (CR 246), he points out that Debbie's pleading is essentially a motion for reconsideration, which is not one of the post-judgment motions authorized by the Montana Rules of Civil Procedure. Bill objects to Debbie's stated intention to sell her safe, noting that it is untimely.² Bill sets forth several reasons as to why Debbie should not be relieved of the obligation to make the \$12,000.00 equalization payment (including that her spending from just one account totaled \$377,605.66 over a 29-month period). Bill argues that these and other expenditures prove that Debbie is not unable to make the payment; she is just choosing to prioritize other expenditures. Finally, Bill points out that the "insurance value" Debbie wishes the district court to use for the Buick is several years out of date.

² The January 3 ruling allotted the parties 10 days to file notice of their intent to exercise the option to sell items of personal property awarded to them.

MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL - 4

4) CR 243, Bill's January 27, 2025 Verified Motion for Supplemental Order Requiring Adjustment of Boundary Line

In this pleading, Bill notes that Debbie's surveyor staked the partition line which will eventually separate their respective parcels of real property so that it runs through the septic drain field of the rental property, in violation of Montana's setback regulations. As such, Bill requests that the district court order the surveyors to move the boundary line approximately 23 feet to comport with setback requirements.

In her February 11, 2025 *Amended Response* (CR 251), Debbie argues that the boundary should actually be moved several hundred feet in the other direction, such that Bill receives one residence and one shop and she receives three residences, three shops, and the majority of the acreage.

5) Bill's February 5, 2025 Motion for Forfeiture of Undisclosed Asset

In this pleading, Bill argues that Debbie failed to disclose the existence of the pending auto insurance claim or the upcoming payment and that she should therefore be required to forfeit the insurance proceeds pursuant to §§40-4-253(4) and (5), MCA. In her February 19, 2025 *Response* (CR 256), Debbie argues that she needn't have disclosed the damage to the Buick or the pending claim because Bill was aware of them. Further, she argues that Bill's request is moot, because he already endorsed the check.

Legal Argument

Parties may only appeal from a final judgment and are specifically prohibited from appealing "interlocutory judgments" to this Court. Mont. R. App. P. 6(5)(f) and 6(6). Any ruling "which leaves matters undetermined is interlocutory in nature and is not a final judgment for the purposes of appeal." *Kirchner v. W. Mont. Regl. Community Mental Health Ctr.*, 261 Mont. 227,

229, 861 P.2d 927, 929 (1993). A "final judgment," on the other hand, "conclusively determines the rights of the parties and settles all claims in controversy in an action[.]" Mont. R. App. P. 4(1)(a).

An appeal which is premature must be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. *In re Marriage of Rex*, 199 Mont. 328, 649 P.2d 46 (1982). Debbie's appeal herein is premature because the district court's *Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order* leave unaddressed the issues of the ownership of the Buick (as well as whether any equalization is owed, and, if so, how much); the parties' respective rights and duties vis-à-vis the rental property in which Debbie was awarded a life estate; the ultimate location of the partition line (and whether its location will alter the number of residences and outbuildings awarded to each party); whether or not the parties may sell certain items of personal property (and whether equalization is payable for certain items); whether Bill should be compelled to submit any documentation to the VA; whether and when Debbie should have to make certain payments to Bill and others; and whether Debbie should be required to forfeit the value of the insurance check.

Accordingly, Bill respectfully moves for the dismissal of Debbie's appeal. In the alternative, Bill requests that this Court issue an order permitting the district court to rule on the aforementioned motions, as the district court has correctly noted that Rule 60(a), M. R. Civ. P. precludes it from doing so without express leave of this Court. *See* CR 255, *Notice to Parties*, dated February 18, 2025, and attached hereto as **Ex. A**.

Debbie's counsel has been provided with a copy of this *Motion* and was asked whether she objects to the same. To date, no response has been received.

1	DATED this 5 day of March 2025.
2	PAOLI & BROWN, P.C.
3	
4	Kevin S. Brown, Esq.
5	
6	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
7	I hereby certify that, on the 5 th day of March, 2025 a true and correct copy
8	of the foregoing document was duly served upon the following named person(s):
9	Via e-filing
10 11	Via email
12	
13	1. Jami Rebsom
14	2. Adrienne Ellington
15	
16	In allers
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
27	
27	
20	
	MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL - 7

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kevin S. Brown, hereby certify that I have served true and accurate copies of the foregoing Motion - Dismiss to the following on 03-05-2025:

Jami L. Rebsom (Attorney) Jami Rebsom Law Firm PO Box 670 Livingston MT 59047 Representing: Deborah White Juhnke Service Method: eService

Adrienne R. Ellington (Attorney) 91 E. Central Belgrade MT 59714 Representing: George Rusty Juhnke Service Method: eService

> Electronically Signed By: Kevin S. Brown Dated: 03-05-2025