

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

JOHN GARLENT HENNE,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

BONITA CAROL HENNE,

Defendant-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
November 6, 1998

No. 201857
Saginaw Circuit Court
LC No. 95-005621 DO

Before: Markman, P.J., and Bandstra and J.F. Kowalski*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Defendant appeals as of right the judgment of divorce entered after trial. We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

On appeal, defendant argues that the trial court abused its discretion in failing to award her alimony in light of the substantial disparity in the parties' incomes. A divorce court has the discretion to award alimony as it considers just and reasonable. MCL 552.23; MSA 25.103; *Magee v Magee*, 218 Mich App 158, 162; 553 NW2d 363 (1996). Relevant factors for the court to consider include the length of the marriage, the parties' ability to pay, their past relations and conduct, their ages, needs, ability to work, health and fault, if any, and all other circumstances of the case. *Magee, supra*. The main objective of alimony is to balance the incomes and needs of the parties in a way that will not impoverish either party. *Id.*; *Hanaway v Hanaway*, 208 Mich App 278, 295; 527 NW2d 792 (1995). This Court will affirm a dispositional ruling as to alimony unless it is left with a firm conviction that the award was inequitable. *McDougal v McDougal*, 451 Mich 80, 87; 545 NW2d 357 (1996).

Defendant has failed to show that the denial of alimony was inequitable. The trial court awarded substantially more than half of the marital assets to defendant. In view of this property division, the trial court declined to enter an alimony award. Given the assets awarded to defendant, the failure to award alimony was not inequitable.

* Circuit judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.

We affirm.

/s/ Stephen J. Markman

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra

/s/ John F. Kowalski