

**NOTICE:** This order was filed under Supreme Court Rule 23 and may not be cited as precedent by any party except in the limited circumstances allowed under Rule 23(e)(1).

---

IN THE  
APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS  
SECOND DISTRICT

---

<i>In re</i> MARRIAGE OF DEDRA L. WRIGHT FLOURNOY,	)	Appeal from the Circuit Court of Lake County.
	)	
Petitioner-Appellant,	)	
	)	
and	)	No. 15-D-566
	)	
KEITH J. FLOURNOY,	)	Honorable
	)	Elizabeth M. Rochford,
Respondent-Appellee.	)	Judge, Presiding.

---

JUSTICE ZENOFF delivered the judgment of the court.  
Justices Schostok and Birkett concurred in the judgment.

**ORDER**

¶ 1 *Held:* The order denying petitioner's request to relocate the parties' minor children to North Carolina was affirmed where the trial court's findings were not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 2 Petitioner, Dedra L. Wright Flournoy, appeals an order entered in the circuit court of Lake County on July 11, 2018, denying her petition to relocate the parties' minor children to North Carolina. She also appeals an August 13, 2018, order that implemented the July order. For the reasons that follow, we affirm.

¶ 3 I. BACKGROUND

¶ 4 Dedra and respondent, Keith J. Flournoy, married in 2001 and resided in Michigan and Ohio before moving to Kildeer, Illinois. Keith's job affords him great flexibility as to where he can live, and the parties' moves through the years coincided with Dedra's changes in employment. Keith and Dedra have three children together: a 16 year-old daughter, a 12 year-old son, and an 11 year-old daughter. Keith has three other children, one of whom was born in 2005 during his marriage to Dedra. Dedra's eventual discovery of the existence of this child apparently precipitated the breakdown of the parties' marriage. Dedra petitioned for divorce in March 2015.

¶ 5 During the pendency of the divorce proceedings, Dedra lost her job and began searching for other work. She was unsuccessful in her attempts to find suitable employment in the greater Chicago area.

¶ 6 Meanwhile, in February 2016, a dispute between the parties at the marital residence escalated into a physical altercation. Although the parties disagree as to the details of the incident and who the aggressor was, the police arrested Keith and he pleaded guilty to simple battery.

¶ 7 On May 24, 2016, the court entered a judgment for dissolution of marriage (JDOM). That judgment incorporated a marital settlement agreement as well as an agreed judgment allocating parental responsibilities between the parties (the allocation judgment). Pursuant to the allocation judgment, the parties were to share parenting responsibilities and be jointly responsible for the major decisions affecting the children. The children would attend public schools in the district where Dedra resided. (At the time of the JDOM, Dedra lived in the marital residence, which was located in a Lake Zurich school district.) The parties would raise the children in the Christian faith. Dedra would have parenting time with the children except during

Keith's regular parenting time. During the summers, the parties contemplated the children spending time with their maternal grandparents in Michigan.

¶ 8 In January 2017, Dedra accepted an offer to be the vice president of human resources for Merchants Distributors, LLC in Hickory, North Carolina. When she was unable to procure Keith's consent to permanently relocate the children to North Carolina, Dedra filed a petition in February 2017 requesting permission to do so.

¶ 9 The matter did not proceed to an evidentiary hearing on Dedra's relocation petition until May 2018. By that point, the parties had sold the marital residence in Kildeer, Dedra had moved to Hickory, North Carolina, and Keith was renting an apartment so he could keep the children in their Lake Zurich school district. Beginning in August 2017, the children resided primarily with Keith, and Dedra exercised parenting time by returning to the Chicago area every other weekend. The children also traveled to North Carolina on occasion to visit Dedra.

¶ 10 The hearing on Dedra's petition spanned seven days.<sup>1</sup> It would be unnecessary and impractical to recount all of the testimony, especially because much of the evidence was conflicting. Generally, Dedra insisted that she did not accept the job in North Carolina for the purpose of depriving Keith access to the children. Instead, she claimed, the position was her "dream job," and it presented her with a tremendous opportunity both professionally and financially. Dedra researched the Hickory area before accepting the position. In her opinion, there were excellent educational opportunities for the children in North Carolina, and they would benefit from a community that was more diverse than the area in Illinois where they presently lived. She explained that she purchased a large home in Hickory and that each child would have his or her own room.

---

<sup>1</sup> The matter simultaneously proceeded to hearing on several other petitions as well.

¶ 11 Dedra also presented evidence that she was deeply committed to her faith and that she was a better role model than Keith. She particularly emphasized the values that were passed to her from her parents, which she hoped to instill in her own children. According to Dedra, Keith was less active in the church than she was. He was also less involved over the years in the household labor and the children's myriad extracurricular activities. Additionally, Dedra believed that Keith had a "faulty moral compass" and that his past behaviors served as poor examples to the children. She complained that Keith was sometimes abusive or demeaning toward her in conversations. She characterized her parents' relationships with the parties' children as being more significant than the relationships that the children had recently formed with members of Keith's side of the family.

¶ 12 Keith, by contrast, presented evidence that the children had ties to his side of the family in the Chicago area. He described himself as having been the children's primary caregiver both during the parties' marriage and after Dedra relocated to North Carolina. In Keith's estimation, he was a good role model and his problems as a husband did not affect his parenting. Although he was uncomfortable attending the family's church in the wake of the divorce, he claimed that he said prayers with the children every day.

¶ 13 Keith further explained that he recently began looking for a home in the Lake Zurich area. His housing needs, however, were dependant on the disposition of Dedra's relocation petition. Keith recognized that the children's summertime visits with Dedra's parents were important, and he did not identify any particular concerns with respect to Dedra's capabilities as a parent. His primary complaints about Dedra were her inability to communicate with him and her unwillingness to facilitate his relationships with the children. Keith feared that his parenting time would be severely limited if the children moved to North Carolina. He explained how

maintaining long-distance relationships with his other children in the past had negatively affected his relationships with those children.

¶ 14 The children's guardian *ad litem* (GAL) recommended denying Dedra's relocation petition. His impression was that both parents were very good role models for the children. He was concerned about Dedra's unwillingness to communicate with Keith and her efforts to marginalize him as a parent. According to the GAL, Keith's relationships with the children would be impacted in a substantial, negative way if they were to move to North Carolina. The GAL believed that Dedra was "very, very angry" with Keith for fathering a child with another woman during the marriage, and that the resulting lack of communication would affect Keith's relationships with the children. The GAL suspected that putting a distance between Keith and the children was part of Dedra's decision-making process in moving to North Carolina.

¶ 15 Dedra disagreed with the GAL's assessments and recommendations. She believed that his investigation was insufficient, and she took issue with many aspects of his reports. She characterized her relationship with the GAL as acrimonious and very difficult. She acknowledged that she shared portions of the GAL's reports with her children. She said that she did so because the children did not feel as though their voices were being reflected in the proceedings.

¶ 16 The children did not testify. They expressed different sentiments at different points to the GAL as to whether they wanted to move to North Carolina. For example, sometimes when the GAL talked to them, they were either against moving to North Carolina or did not express an unequivocal preference. A few weeks before the evidentiary hearing on Dedra's relocation petition, however, the children wrote a letter to the trial court. In that letter, they expressed their desires to live with Dedra and to spend more weeks with their maternal grandparents during the

summers. Around the same time, the children reiterated their wishes to relocate to North Carolina in conversations with both Keith and the GAL. Keith suspected that Dedra may have forced the children to write the letter or otherwise manipulated them. The GAL testified that there was a red flag in his mind about the letter, given that the children wrote it shortly after visiting Dedra in North Carolina. Dedra acknowledged that the children wrote the letter during her parenting time, but she denied participating in drafting it. When asked whether she told the children to write a letter to the judge, she responded that she talked to them about using writing as a way to convey their information and that they could choose to write a letter to the judge or the guardian *ad litem*.

¶ 17 On July 11, 2018, the court denied Dedra’s relocation petition and made lengthy oral findings, which we will detail in the analysis section. Dedra filed a notice of appeal from that order six days later. On August 13, the court modified the parties’ allocation judgment to account for the fact that the children were now residing primarily with Keith. On the same day, the court modified Dedra’s child support obligation in accordance with the financial information that was presented at the evidentiary hearing. Dedra filed a timely separate notice of appeal from the August 13 orders. We consolidated the two appeals for purposes of briefing and disposition.

¶ 18

## II. ANALYSIS

¶ 19 Dedra contends that, as a matter of law, the court failed to properly apply the statutory best-interest factors when ruling on her relocation petition. She insists that the court’s concerns about her anger toward Keith and her potential to marginalize him as a parent were issues that were relevant only to the tenth statutory factor (see 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(10) (West 2016) (“minimization of the impairment to a parent-child relationship caused by a parent’s relocation”)). She complains that the court’s subjective perceptions in those respects colored its

evaluation of other factors. Dedra also submits that the court's decision was against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 20 There is no bright-line test for determining whether to grant a petition to relocate, and the trial court must instead evaluate the circumstances on a case-by-case basis. *In re Marriage of Eckert*, 119 Ill. 2d 316, 326 (1988). The party seeking relocation bears the burden to establish that doing so is in the best interests of the children. *Eckert*, 119 Ill. 2d at 325. Section 609.2(g) of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act (750 ILCS 5/609.2(g) (West 2016)) lists 11 factors to consider when ascertaining the children's best interests in connection with a relocation petition. Depending on the circumstances of the case, some factors may weigh more heavily than others. *In re Parentage of P.D.*, 2017 IL App (2d) 170355, ¶ 49. Accordingly, "[t]he final decision in a removal case ought not be based on which party won the most factors." *P.D.*, 2017 IL App (2d) 170355, ¶ 49. Instead, the trial court should "consider[ ] all of the circumstances to arrive at a reasonable result." *P.D.*, 2017 IL App (2d) 170355, ¶ 49.

¶ 21 We apply a strong presumption in favor of the trial court's decision, given that the trial court is in the best position to evaluate the parties' respective temperaments, personalities, and capabilities. *In re Marriage of Kavchak*, 2018 IL App (2d) 170853, ¶ 65. It is not our role as a court of review to reweigh the competing considerations involved in the case. *Kavchak*, 2018 IL App (2d) 170853, ¶ 65. We will not reverse the decision unless it was against the manifest weight of the evidence, which means that the opposite conclusion was clearly apparent or the court's findings were unreasonable, arbitrary, or not based on the evidence that was presented. *Kavchak*, 2018 IL App (2d) 170853, ¶ 65.

¶ 22 In support of her argument that the court erred as a matter of law, Dedra provides general citations to four cases. She asserts that the courts in those cases "looked to the factors as being

discrete areas of inquiry to be looked at objectively on an individual basis first and only then collectively.” She criticizes the trial court here for supposedly taking “a different perspective by elevating one factor and using that to negate the conclusions that otherwise would have been drawn under the other factors.”

¶ 23 Dedra’s contention that the court committed error “as a matter of law” is unavailing. The court made detailed findings with respect to each of the statutory factors. To the extent that Dedra disagrees with the court’s evaluation of those factors—*i.e.*, the court’s repeated emphasis on her anger toward Keith and her unwillingness to foster his relationships with the children—this merely bleeds into her other argument that the order denying the relocation petition was against the manifest weight of the evidence. As explained below, the court’s findings were amply supported by the evidence.

¶ 24 The court made certain preliminary observations regarding the demeanor of the witnesses. For example, the court’s impression was that Dedra was intelligent and “extraordinarily focused and driven.” At the same time, it was clear to the court that “Dedra has no respect for Keith as a person, as a man, or as a father.” Indeed, “[s]he views herself and her family, her parents specifically, as superior to Keith in every regard.” The court noted that Dedra’s parents likewise made no “effort to disguise their dislike and lack of trust for Keith.” Keith, by contrast, was more open to communicating with Dedra for the children’s benefit, and he did “not demonstrate the outward animosity towards Dedra that she evidences toward him.” The court also rejected Dedra’s attempts to call the GAL’s investigation into question, finding that the GAL was “sufficiently thorough and sincere.” The court believed that the GAL’s conclusions and recommendations were well-reasoned and entitled to significant weight.



¶ 25 The court then turned to the statutory best-interest factors. The first factor is “the circumstances and reasons for the intended relocation.” 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(1) (West 2016). The court recalled that the GAL indicated that the relocation was related to Dedra’s employment. Meanwhile, Keith argued that the relocation was actually motivated by Dedra’s desires to control the children and punish him for having an affair. Dedra, in turn, maintained that she was unable to find a job in Illinois and that the position in North Carolina gave her independence and allowed her to provide a superior lifestyle for the children. The court found that Dedra’s job in North Carolina was high-paying and came with substantial benefits and opportunities for bonuses. Recalling one witness’s testimony about Dedra’s desire for a fresh start, the court also found that relocating allowed Dedra to achieve “financial and geographic independence from Keith.” The court believed that this fresh start was “a key component of [Dedra’s] motivation for moving to North Carolina.” According to the court:

“The deep sense of betrayal and anger that Dedra feels toward Keith is evident to the Court in every aspect of her presence, by her spoken word, by her physical language [*sic*] and her demeanor. Dedra’s eagerness and commitment to begin a new life with her children and away from Keith is unquestionable.”

¶ 26 The second factor is “the reasons, if any, why a parent is objecting to the intended relocation.” 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(2) (West 2016). The court recounted that Keith claimed that his objection stemmed from “a sincere desire to maintain the established relationship with his children and from a concern for Dedra’s desire and intent to obstruct his relationship with them.” Dedra responded that the children’s relationships with Keith were illusory, as he was an absent parent. Dedra also discounted the time that Keith spent with the children to the extent that it was not rooted in cultural or religious activities. The court found that, although the commitment of

Dedra and her parents to cultural activities was admirable and would “bring expanded opportunities and broadened horizons for these wonderful children,” such activities were neither superior to or a substitute for the other experiences that Keith had shared with the children.

¶ 27 The third factor is “the history and quality of each parent’s relationship with the child and specifically whether a parent has substantially failed or refused to exercise the parental responsibilities allocated to him or her under the parenting plan or allocation judgment.” 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(3) (West 2016). The court determined that both parents were very involved with the children’s lives and that neither of them failed or refused to exercise parental responsibilities. Additionally, the court noted that all three children enjoyed meaningful relationships with both parents. The court mentioned that Dedra credited herself exclusively for the children’s academic, social, and personal achievements, whereas Keith emphasized that he had served as the primary residential parent in Dedra’s absence for the past 11 months. The court further observed that, although Keith had concerns about Dedra’s potential interference with his relationships with the children, he did not diminish her role in the children’s lives or deny her positive influence on them. In the court’s view, it was particularly “telling” that Keith was willing to allow the children to spend a substantial portion of their summers with Dedra’s parents. Keith’s actions in that regard convinced the court that he recognized the value in the children’s relationships with Dedra’s parents. The court added: “What is vividly revealed to the Court here is not only that both parents enjoy an important and irreplaceable role in the children’s lives, but that Dedra will not or cannot recognize any value in Keith’s time and relationship with his children.”

¶ 28 The fourth factor is “the educational opportunities for the child at the existing location and at the proposed new location.” 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(4) (West 2016). The court explained

that the GAL concluded that the school system in North Carolina was rated slightly higher than the Lake Zurich schools. However, the GAL added that the parties had previously chosen the Lake Zurich school system for their children, and the children had a history of success in those schools. The court noted that Dedra argued that there were superior educational opportunities in North Carolina, whereas Keith argued that there were comparable opportunities in the two locations. The court recalled that the children's eldest daughter was currently exercising an opportunity through Lake Zurich High School to attend a program for high-achieving students interested in pursuing medical careers. Although that daughter might be eligible for a dual enrollment program with a local university if she moved to North Carolina, the court found that the schools in Illinois and North Carolina both offered significant opportunities. With respect to the parties' other children, the court recognized that it would be a "positive bonus" for the children to attend a school in North Carolina with African-American leadership. Nevertheless, the court was not persuaded by Dedra's claims that the children would escape the possibility of "racially motivated incidents," which they had purportedly experienced in the Lake Zurich school system, if they moved to North Carolina. Furthermore, although the parties' eldest daughter had recently been suspended from school, the court found that this issue was "not necessarily attributable to the Lake Zurich school system or the residential placement with her father." Instead, it was just as likely related to "the challenges and stress of this family's ongoing litigation or the typical strains of being a teenager." For all of these reasons, the court found that the educational opportunities that were available in Lake Zurich and North Carolina were "reasonably similar[,] with an extra benefit of African-American leadership and greater racial diversity among the student population in North Carolina."

¶ 29 The fifth factor is “the presence or absence of extended family at the existing location and at the proposed new location.” 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(5) (West 2016). The court noted that the children have three siblings, an aunt, and other extended family on Keith’s side who reside in Illinois. Dedra argued that the children’s relationships with those particular relatives were tenuous and of recent origin, and she instead highlighted the children’s relationships with her own parents, who reside in Michigan. The court found that, apart from the children’s relationships with Dedra and Keith, the children were closest to and most influenced by Dedra’s parents. The court determined that the children’s relationships with Dedra’s parents were “not dependant on an award of relocation,” but would “continue to be fostered by all parties.” Moreover, the court considered the testimony of Keith’s aunt, whom the court found to be “warm and sincere and genuinely loving of these children and supportive of them and their relationship with their father and extended family.” The court found that the parties’ children did not have meaningful relationships with two of Keith’s three other children, but that they had a “meaningful, consistent, and close relationship” with the third child.

¶ 30 The sixth factor is “the anticipated impact of the relocation of the child.” 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(6) (West 2016). The court acknowledged that there would be an “unavoidable and meaningful impact” on the children irrespective of whether the request for relocation was granted, given that one parent would necessarily be at a distance. The court was confident that the children would continue to experience success in either Illinois or North Carolina. Nevertheless, the court could not ignore that Dedra’s changes in employment had required her to move across state lines multiple times. The court indicated that there was a benefit to the children experiencing stability in their academic and personal lives, especially in the absence of an intact family.

¶ 31 Factor seven is “whether the court will be able to fashion a reasonable allocation of parental responsibilities between all parents if the relocation occurs.” 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(7) (West 2016). According to the court, irrespective of whether it granted Dedra’s petition, it could craft and administer a schedule for parenting time. However, the court expressed its concern that, if the relocation petition were granted, Dedra might “technically comply with the parenting time requirements” without “enthusiastically support[ing] the continued relationship between the children and their father.”

¶ 32 Factor eight is “the wishes of the child, taking into account the child’s maturity and ability to express reasoned and independent preferences as to relocation.” 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(8) (West 2016). The court explained that the children were at times either noncommittal about the prospect of moving or even desirous of remaining in Illinois. In April 2018, however, they signed a letter expressing their wishes to live with Dedra and to spend more time with their maternal grandparents during the summers. In a subsequent conversation with the GAL, the children reiterated that they wanted to live with Dedra. According to the court, it was “impossible to know with certainty whether they reached this new conclusion independently or by the influence of their mother[,] who this Court has observed to be a very strong and determined person.” The court said that it was “genuinely disappointed” that Dedra gave the GAL’s report to her eldest daughter, as it was not intended for the children and doing so “thrust [the children] into the litigation in an inappropriate way.” The court also considered the timing of the children’s letter to be suspect, given that they wrote it soon after they spent their spring break with Dedra in North Carolina. Along the same lines, the court noted that the letter was written after the children participated in counseling that Dedra secretly arranged for them. The

court recalled that Dedra admitted during her testimony that she had instructed the children to use their words. According to the court:

“These young shoulders should not have been burdened to carry the weight of these difficult adult decisions or to think that they have exclusive power to make them, especially a decision that places them squarely in conflict with the two people they love best, their parents, and requiring them to choose.”

The court also found that it was “concerning and curious” that the children, in lockstep, communicated their desires to move to North Carolina and to spend three consecutive weeks with Dedra’s parents over the summer. After relating these observations and concerns, the court provided its assurance that it gave “careful and deliberate consideration and significant weight to the expressed wishes of the children.”

¶ 33 Factor nine involves the “possible arrangements for the exercise of parental responsibilities appropriate to the parents’ resources and circumstances and the developmental level of the child.” 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(9) (West 2016). The court found that both parties had the financial means and physical ability to travel, and that the children were likewise capable of doing so. The court stated that its “far greater concern” was “whether the parents will be encouraging and supportive of the parenting time and the continuing relationship with the other parent and which of these alternate situations will provide for the least disruption.”

¶ 34 Factor ten is the “minimization of the impairment to a parent-child relationship caused by a parent’s relocation.” 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(10) (West 2016). Dedra proposed that Keith could exercise his parenting time in North Carolina every other week, that he could video conference with the children during the week, and that the parties could split the children’s summer breaks.

Even so, the court shared the GAL's concern that Keith's relationships with the children would be minimized in the event the court granted the relocation petition.

¶ 35 The final statutory consideration is “any other relevant factors bearing on the children’s best interests.” 750 ILCS 5/609.2(g)(11) (West 2016). The court noted that Dedra urged the court to consider both Keith’s poor moral character and the domestic violence incident between the parties. The court characterized Keith’s actions in fathering a child with another woman and then hiding that information from Dedra as “a shocking, disappointing and devastating revelation for this family.” Nevertheless, the court could not use relocation as a punishment, because Keith’s conduct in this respect was “neither a factor of disqualification for parenting time nor \*\*\* a proper basis for a grant of relocation.” The court also emphasized that Dedra was aware of both Keith’s affair and the domestic violence incident before she entered into the joint parenting agreement and before she relocated to North Carolina. It was disingenuous of Dedra to raise those issues now, as it was clear to the court that “Dedra would never have left the children in Keith’s care for such an extended period if she truly believed him to be a physical or moral danger to them.” Moreover, although Dedra had concerns about Keith raising the children in an apartment, the court noted that Keith procured that apartment on an emergency basis to maintain the children’s enrollment in their schools when Dedra relocated to North Carolina. The court found Keith to be credible when he provided assurances that he would secure a larger, more appropriate home within the Lake Zurich school district if the relocation petition were denied.

¶ 36 After considering all of the statutory factors, the court commented that the parties’ children were “remarkable in many ways” and that “their many achievements and successes are a credit to both mother and father.” According to the court, Dedra bore the burden of proof with respect to the petition, and the court could not “help but be influenced by Dedra’s disdain and

contempt for Keith which has been palpable throughout the entirety of these proceedings.” There might be a legitimate basis for such anger, the court said, but Dedra’s unwillingness to recognize any value in Keith’s contributions or his role as a parent posed an impediment to granting the request for relocation. The court stressed that its paramount responsibility was to preserve the children’s healthy and secure relationships with both parents. In that respect, the court was certain that moving the children to North Carolina would “result in a minimization of Keith’s role as a parent.” Accordingly, the court denied Dedra’s relocation petition.

¶ 37 The court’s decision was not against the manifest weight of the evidence. The court considered all of the relevant factors, meticulously explaining its reasoning and findings. The court’s assessment of each individual factor was reasonable, and its ultimate decision to deny the petition was justified by the evidence. The court was appropriately concerned that Dedra would use the children’s relocation as an opportunity to minimize their relationships with Keith. Contrary to what Dedra suggests, this overarching concern was relevant to several of the rather open-ended statutory factors, not necessarily just the tenth factor. There was also nothing improper about the court placing greater emphasis on some aspects of the evidence than others. “A determination of the best interests of the child cannot be reduced to a simple bright-line test, but rather must be made on a case-by-case basis, depending, to a great extent, upon the circumstances of each case.” *Eckert*, 119 Ill. 2d at 326. Depending on the evidence that is presented, some of the factors listed in the statute may well take on greater significance than others. See *P.D.*, 2017 IL App (2d) 170355, ¶ 49.

¶ 38 To be sure, the parties presented conflicting evidence on many issues. Dedra criticizes the trial court for supposedly failing to evaluate the evidence objectively. In doing so, however, she offers a thoroughly one-sided presentation of the facts and gives short-shrift to the court’s



thoughtful analysis of the competing interests at stake. The court was fully aware, for example, of Dedra's perspective about the parties' parenting roles, the allegations of domestic violence, and the proffered reasons for relocating to North Carolina. The court was also aware of the concerns raised by both Keith and the GAL about allowing the children to relocate to North Carolina. It is not our role to reweigh the evidence. Quite simply, this is not a case where the opposite conclusion was clearly apparent or the court's findings were unreasonable, arbitrary, or not based on the evidence that was presented. See *Kavchak*, 2018 IL App (2d) 170853, ¶ 65. We thus affirm the trial court's July 11, 2018, order denying Dedra's petition to relocate.

¶ 39 Dedra separately appeals the court's August 13, 2018, orders, which implemented the July 11 ruling by modifying her child support obligation and modifying certain aspects of the parties' allocation judgment. Dedra acknowledges that the propriety of the August orders depends on our decision with respect to the request to relocate and makes no further argument with respect to these orders. Having affirmed the order denying the relocation petition, we likewise affirm the orders of August 13.

¶ 40

### III. CONCLUSION

¶ 41 For the reasons stated, we affirm the judgment of the circuit court of Lake County.

¶ 42 Affirmed.