

NOTICE
This Order was filed under Supreme Court Rule 23 and is not precedent except in the limited circumstances allowed under Rule 23(e)(1).

2026 IL App (4th) 260342-U

NO. 4-26-0342

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF ILLINOIS

FOURTH DISTRICT

FILED

August 18, 2026

Carla Bender

4th District Appellate

Court, IL

LAURIE B.,	)	Appeal from the
Petitioner-Appellant,	)	Circuit Court of
v.	)	Sangamon County
NATHAN S.,	)	No. 21F261
Respondent-Appellee.	)	
	)	Honorable
	)	Jennifer M. Ascher,
	)	Judge Presiding.

PRESIDING JUSTICE STEIGMANN delivered the judgment of the court.
Justices DeArmond and Harris concurred in the judgment.

ORDER

¶ 1 *Held:* The appellate court affirmed the trial court's granting of the father's motion to modify parenting time.

¶ 2 Respondent, Nathan S., and petitioner, Laurie B., are the parents of a minor child, J.A.B., who was born in July 2015. They never married, but a judgment of affiliation regarding the child and the parties was entered in August 2021. In April 2022, an agreed order was entered awarding joint decision-making authority to the parties and setting parenting time for each parent.

¶ 3 In May 2025, Nathan filed a motion to modify parenting time. The trial court later heard evidence regarding Nathan's motion, concluded that Nathan had sufficiently shown changes in circumstances that necessitated modification in order to serve the child's best interests, and awarded Nathan sole decision-making authority regarding education, medical care,

religious practices, and extracurricular activities. The court also directed that J.A.B. should reside with Nathan, subject to Laurie's periods of alternating weekend parenting time.

¶ 4 Laurie appeals, arguing that (1) the trial court's order granting Nathan's petition for modification was against the manifest weight of the evidence and (2) the court erred by denying her motion for reconsideration of the court's granting of Nathan's motion.

¶ 5 We disagree and affirm.

¶ 6 I. BACKGROUND

¶ 7 In June 2016, a judgment of affiliation regarding J.A.B. was entered in Oakland County, Michigan. Various other orders were entered in Michigan regarding J.A.B. and her parents through August 2021.

¶ 8 In October 2021, the Michigan judgment and related orders were enrolled in Sangamon County, Illinois. In April 2022, an agreed order was entered in Sangamon County, awarding joint decision-making authority to the parties and setting forth parenting time for each parent.

¶ 9 In May 2025, Nathan filed a motion to modify parenting time, which is the subject of this appeal. In that motion, Nathan noted that under the orders currently in effect, the parties had joint decision-making authority on significant issues relating to J.A.B. However, Nathan alleged that since the entry of the orders then in effect, substantial changes in circumstances had occurred, which the motion set forth in detail. In his motion, Nathan requested, among other relief, the trial court to enter an order modifying parental responsibilities so that Nathan had a majority of parenting time with J.A.B. and sole decision-making authority on significant issues regarding her.

¶ 10 Laurie denied the allegations in Nathan's petition, and the trial court appointed a

guardian *ad litem* in this case. The court then conducted hearings on September 15, September 17, and September 24, 2025, during which the court received evidence and testimony.

¶ 11 The trial court took the matter under advisement after the conclusion of the September hearings, and in December 2025, the court entered a lengthy written order of modification. In that order, the court concluded that Nathan had sufficiently shown changes in circumstances that necessitated modification of the orders previously entered. The court concluded that it would be in J.A.B.’s best interests to award sole decision-making authority regarding education, medical care, religious practices, and extracurricular activities to Nathan. In that order, the court also directed that J.A.B. shall reside with Nathan, subject to Laurie’s period of alternating weekend parenting time, as more fully outlined in the written order.

¶ 12 Later in December 2025, Laurie filed a “motion for reconsideration and/or rehearing.” She also filed a second “motion for reconsideration and/or rehearing” in January 2026.

¶ 13 In February 2026, the trial court conducted a hearing on those motions and denied them.

¶ 14 This appeal followed.

¶ 15 II. ANALYSIS

¶ 16 Laurie appeals, arguing that (1) the trial court’s order granting Nathan’s petition for modification was against the manifest weight of the evidence and (2) the court erred by denying her motion for reconsideration of the court’s granting of Nathan’s motion.

¶ 17 We previously mentioned that the trial court in this case conducted three days of hearings in September 2025, at which it received evidence and testimony. Yet, as Nathan correctly notes in his brief, “the record on appeal contains no report of proceedings regarding

these hearings, whether through transcripts, a bystander's report of the testimony, or an agreed statement of facts."

¶ 18 In Laurie's brief to this court, she spends 15 pages discussing the testimony presented at the hearing on Nathan's motion for modification but, contrary to Illinois Supreme Court rules, her brief contains no citation to the record where any of that testimony appears. No doubt that is because Laurie has not provided this court on appeal with a report of proceedings to which she could cite.

¶ 19 The Illinois Supreme Court has made clear that
"an appellant has the burden to present a sufficiently complete record of the proceedings at trial to support a claim of error, and in the absence of such a record on appeal, it will be presumed that the order entered by the trial court was in conformity with law and had a sufficient factual basis." *Foutch v. O'Bryant*, 99 Ill. 2d 389, 391-92 (1984).

Moreover, "[a]ny doubts which may arise from the incompleteness of the record will be resolved against the appellant." *Id.* at 392.

¶ 20 Because Laurie has failed to provide this court with a record of the proceedings before the trial court, this court has nothing to review regarding Laurie's claims that the trial court's decision was against the manifest weight of the evidence or that the trial court otherwise committed error by denying her motion for reconsideration. Accordingly, we reject all of Laurie's claims on appeal.

¶ 21 Before concluding, we wish to commend the trial court for its thoughtful and detailed discussion of the evidence in this case, as well as its careful analysis of the statutory factors that applied regarding the petition for modification. We are confident that if this court had

had occasion to address this appeal on its merits, the trial court's detailed, 20-page written order would have proven very helpful.

¶ 22

III. CONCLUSION

¶ 23

For the reasons stated, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

¶ 24

Affirmed.