



protection against respondent and awarded temporary custody of Saquoia. Respondent received supervised visitation every Thursday from 1:30 to 2:30 p.m. in the Sangamon County basement lunch room.

¶ 5 On April 13, 2012, the trial court consolidated case No. 10-OP-894 with the divorce proceeding. At a May 8, 2012, case-management conference, the court found there existed "an impediment to mediation" and scheduled a final hearing on the petition for dissolution and the petition to extend the plenary order of protection, which was to expire on July 12, 2012.

¶ 6 After the final hearing on June 25, 2012, the trial court entered a judgment ordering (1) the plenary order of protection extended to June 25, 2014, (2) full custody of Saquoia to petitioner with restricted visitation to remain as previously ordered, and (3) the dissolution of marriage. According to the docket entry, both parties were present, evidence was presented, and respondent had proceeded *pro se*. On July 10, 2012, the court entered a written final judgment of dissolution. This appeal followed.

¶ 7 II. ANALYSIS

¶ 8 Respondent filed this *pro se* appeal challenging the trial court's final judgment of dissolution with regard to (1) the order extending the plenary order of protection, and (2) the order awarding custody of the minor to petitioner and restricting respondent's visitation. Respondent claims, in a general and conclusory manner, the court's decisions were based on incompetent evidence in the form of hearsay, defamatory statements, and general untruths. Without finding evidence supporting his claims, we affirm.

¶ 9 We have no verbatim transcript from the trial in this matter available to us, and therefore we have no means of ascertaining whether the alleged errors occurred. Further, respondent

failed to submit a bystander's report or an agreed statement of facts pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 323(c) (eff. Dec. 13, 2005) reflecting the trial court proceeding. Without an ability to review the proceedings from the trial court, we are unable to determine if an error occurred. "A party who prosecutes an appeal has the duty of presenting to the court of review everything necessary to decide the issues on appeal." *Brandel Realty Co. v. Olson*, 159 Ill. App. 3d 230, 233 (1987).

"[A]n 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. Any doubts which may arise from the incompleteness of the record will be resolved against the appellant."

*Foutch v. O'Bryant*, 99 Ill. 2d 389, 391-392 (1984).

¶ 10 Respondent has failed to provide this court with a sufficient record to support his claims. As a result, we must presume the trial court's decisions regarding child custody, visitation, and the extension of the order of protection were in conformity with the law and with the evidence presented. Therefore, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

¶ 11 III. CONCLUSION

¶ 12 For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

¶ 13 Affirmed.