

**COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO**

**EIGHTH APPELLATE DISTRICT  
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA**

S. KAREN MACHEN,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff-Appellant/ Cross-Appellee,	:	No. 112644
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
ALFRED THOMAS MILLER, JR.,	:	
	:	
Defendant-Appellee/ Cross-Appellant.	:	

---

**JOURNAL ENTRY AND OPINION**

**JUDGMENT:** AFFIRMED IN PART, REVERSED IN PART,  
AND REMANDED  
**RELEASED AND JOURNALIZED:** April 4, 2024

---

Civil Appeal from the Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas  
Domestic Relations Division  
Case No. DR-18-374625

---

***Appearances:***

Rosenthal | Thurman | Lane, L.L.C., Scott S. Rosenthal,  
and James L. Lane, *for appellant/cross-appellee.*

Stafford Law Co., L.P.A., Joseph G. Stafford, Nicole A.  
Cruz, and Kelley R. Tauring, *for appellee/cross-appellant.*

LISA B. FORBES, J.:

{¶ 1} S. Karen Machen appeals from the trial court’s “Qualified Domestic Relations Order” in this divorce case. After reviewing the facts of the case and

pertinent law, we affirm in part, reverse in part, and remand this case to the trial court for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

{¶ 2} A detailed recitation of the underlying facts in this case can be found in our opinion regarding the companion cases, *Machen v. Miller*, 8th Dist. Cuyahoga Nos. 112453, 112454, and 112479 (the “Companion Case”). Furthermore, the four assignments of error in this case are duplicative of four of the 18 assignments of error in the Companion Case. Assignment of error No. 1 is the same as assignment of error No. 2 in the Companion Case, which was sustained. Assignment of error No. 2 is the same as assignment of error No. 10 in the Companion Case, which was sustained. Assignment of error No. 3 is the same as assignment of error No. 17 in the Companion Case, which was overruled as moot. Assignment of error No. 4 is the same as assignment of error No. 18 in the Companion Case, which was sustained.

{¶ 3} Accordingly, and for the same reasons as in the Companion Case, assignments of error Nos. 1, 2, and 4 are sustained, and assignment of error No. 3 is overruled as moot.

{¶ 4} Judgment affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded to the trial court for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

It is ordered that appellant/cross-appellee and appellee/cross-appellant costs share costs herein taxed.

The court finds there were reasonable grounds for this appeal.

It is ordered that a special mandate be sent to said court to carry this judgment into execution.

A certified copy of this entry shall constitute the mandate pursuant to Rule 27  
of the Rules of Appellate Procedure.

---

LISA B. FORBES, JUDGE

MARY EILEEN KILBANE, P.J., and  
SEAN C. GALLAGHER, J., CONCUR