

**BEFORE THE ALASKA OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS ON REFERRAL
BY THE COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
D. N.	)	OAH No. 25-2821-CSS
_____	)	

DECISION AND ORDER UPON CONSENT OF THE PARTIES

A December 2, 2024, Decision and Order was issued by this tribunal in this matter, setting K. D.'s child support obligation for his daughter T. D. at \$481 per month effective August 1, 2024, and ongoing based on a primary custody calculation. On or about January 30, 2025, custodial parent D. N. requested a modification review of the calculation, believing that Mr. D.'s earnings had increased. On August 2, 2025, the Child Support Enforcement Decision (Division) issued a Modified Administrative Support Order increasing Mr. D.'s monthly support obligation for T. to \$652 per month effective July 1, 2025, and ongoing based on a primary custody calculation. Ms. N. appealed the decision, asserting that the Division did not timely act on her January 2025 modification request, resulting in an unjustly delayed effective date for the increased support obligation.

A formal telephonic hearing was initially scheduled for September 30, 2025, but at Mr. D.'s request was continued to October 10, 2025. Ms. N. participated and represented herself. Mr. D. participated and represented himself. The Division was represented by Child Support Specialist Shawn Pattison.

Mr. D. testified that as directed in the December 2, 2024, Decision and Order he provided Mr. Pattison updated information regarding his new employment and wages in early January 2025. This was confirmed by Mr. Pattison. Ms. N. provided the emails she had submitted to CSED inquiring about Mr. D.'s new employment and income information dating back to January 30, 2025. Mr. Pattison testified that that the emails Ms. N. sent were seemingly misconstrued by CSED as an asset locate request rather than the modification request that she intended and the parties understood would occur due to Mr. D.'s updated employment information.. For this reason CSED did not immediately act on the modification request, and the resulting Modified Administrative Support Order increasing Mr. D.'s child support obligation did not issue until August 2, 2025.

The parties discussed the administrative mistake and agreed that had the request been processed timely, per regulation the upward support modification would have become effective on February 1, 2025, the month following the submission of the request.¹ The parties concurred that this would be the agreed upon effective date of the August 2, 2025 Modified Administrative Support Order.

Regarding the accuracy of the support calculation in accordance with Civil Rule 90.3, Mr. Pattison testified that it was based on the employment and wage information obtained from Mr. D.'s current employer. The parties agreed that the calculation was accurate and appropriately increased to \$652 per month. This was based upon a gross income from wages of \$47,291.92 minus applicable deductions of \$683.35 per month resulting in an annual adjusted income of \$39,091.72. Pursuant to Rule 90.3 20% is to be allotted for child support for one child, resulting in a child support calculation of \$7,818.34 annually or \$652 monthly.

The administrative law judge has reviewed the parties' settlement and concurs that the modified child support obligation is correctly calculated under Civil Rule 90.3 and that the effective date should be changed to February 1, 2025.

The parties' settlement is adopted.

V. Child Support Order

1. K. D. is liable for child support in the amount of \$652 per month for one child effective February 1, 2025, and ongoing.
2. All other terms of the Modified Administrative Child Support and Medical Support Order dated August 2, 2025, remain in full force and effect.

Dated: October 14, 2025

SIGNED
Beth Goldstein
Administrative Law Judge

[This document has been modified to conform to the technical standards for publication. Names may have been changed to protect privacy.]

¹ 15 AAC 125.321(d).