

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

In re the Marriage of  
ANDRE BRICE and JUDY C. HARRIS.

---

ANDRE BRICE,

Respondent,

v.

JUDY C. HARRIS,

Appellant.

B236787

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. BD513476)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.  
Teresa A. Beaudet, Judge. Affirmed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Judy C. Harris, in pro. per., for Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.  
\_\_\_\_\_

Judy C. Harris appeals from the judgment of dissolution of her marriage to Andre Brice. On appeal, Harris challenges only the award of attorney fees. We affirm.

All of Harris's arguments on appeal are based on her contention that Brice did not serve and file in the trial court a final income and expense declaration, so his request for attorney fees was both legally improper and not supported by substantial evidence. We disagree.

The clerk's transcript contains a proof of service stating that on January 11, 2011, Brice served his final income and expense declaration on Harris by personal service. On that same date, the trial court entered a minute order directing Brice to file "updated documents" by January 18, 2011. On January 18, 2011, the court entered a minute order stating that "[t]he documents requested by the Court have been submitted." It is not clear from the clerk's transcript whether those documents included Brice's final income and expense declaration. But the reporter's transcript of the trial on January 20, 2011, reflects that Brice's income and expense declaration was admitted as Exhibit 12. The minute order for that day likewise reflects that Brice's income and expense declaration was admitted as Exhibit 12. The record therefore unambiguously confirms that Brice's income and expense declaration was admitted before the trial court ruled on Brice's request for attorney fees. We consequently must reject Harris's arguments.

Brice conservatively estimated that he had incurred \$6,000 in attorney fees, and he requested an attorney fees award of \$4,000. The court awarded \$3,000, and Harris has not carried her burden of showing that the court erred. (See *State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. Pietak* (2001) 90 Cal.App.4th 600, 610 ["The burden of affirmatively demonstrating error is on the appellant"].) Accordingly, we must affirm.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed. Respondent shall recover his costs of appeal, if any.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

ROTHSCHILD, Acting P. J.

We concur:

CHANEY, J.

JOHNSON, J.