## SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA (FAMILY DIVISION)

Citation: Strecko v. Strecko, 2013 NSSC 49

**Date:** 20130207

**Docket:** 1201-063118

**Registry:** Halifax

**Between:** 

Jane Wagner Strecko

**Applicant** 

and

Brian Frank Strecko

Respondent

## LIBRARY HEADING

**Judge:** The Honourable Associate Chief Justice Lawrence I. O'Neil

**Hearing:** November 19, 20 and 21, 2012

**Issues:** 

- 1. Should spousal support be terminated? Varied?
- 2. Should income be attributable to the Applicant?
- 3. What is the meaning and effect of the parties' Corollary Relief Order which mandated a review of spousal support and required the Applicant to seek employment? Was it transitional?
- 4. What child support is payable while the parties' son is attending university? Between university years? Should the table amount apply to income greater than \$150,000?
- 5. What income level should be used, if any, to calculate child and spousal support payable by the husband? Should it include bonus and dividend income?

**Summary:** 

The parties' Corollary Relief Order signed March 4, 2010, provided there would not be a review of spousal support earlier than July 1, 2012. The order also required the Applicant to seek employment and expressed an expectation that she might be self sufficient at the time of the review. The Respondent argued that the 'CRO' provided for transitional spousal support and no further spousal support should be ordered. Related issues were whether income should be imputed to the Applicant and whether child support for the parties' son should continue given he was now attending university.

The Court held that spousal support should continue at the existing level for an additional two years. The Court concluded that the parties had agreed to not follow the Spousal Support Advisory Guidelines when determining the appropriate level of spousal support. The Court also

concluded that the "benchmark" for determining self sufficiency of Ms. Strecko was her earning the salary equivalent to that of a nurse.

The Court concluded that the Applicant had not yet achieved that level of income. The Court ordered a termination of the spousal support obligation in March 2015 subject only to the Applicant seeking to continue the spousal support.

The Court ordered child support at less than the table amount payable to the Applicant for December, February and April while the parties' son is away at university. The table amount of child support based on Mr. Strecko's line 150 income, is payable when the son is between university years provided he is residing with his mother full time. If not living with his mother but still attending university full time, the son shall receive \$1,000 per month directly from his father as a contribution to his university expenses (shelter costs), including over the summer.

The Court ordered contributions to meeting the son's university expenses on the same basis as that followed with the older son. The funding of the younger son was directed to consist of the following components:

- (a) the son's contribution;
- (b) the father's contribution;
- (c) the mother's contribution;
- (d) educational plan funding; and
- (e) bank financing or the like if necessary.

**Keywords:** Spousal Support Guidelines; imputing income; special university expenses

**Legislation:** Divorce Act, R.S.C., 1985, c.3 (2<sup>nd</sup> Supp.)

Matrimonial Property Act, R.S.N.S., 1989, c.275

Cases Considered: Niles v. Munro, 2010 NSSC 221

Provost v. Marsden, 2009 NSSC 365 Eyking v. Eyking, 2012 NSSC 409 Burchill v. Savoie, 2008 NSSC 307

Lu v. Sun, 2005 NSCA 112 Leet v. Beach, 2010 NSSC 433 Marshall v. Marshall, 2008 NSSC 11

D.B.S. v. S.R.G., 2006 SCC 37

MacIsaac v. MacIsaac [1996] N.S.J. 185

Conrad v. Rafuse, 2002 NSCA 60 Pollock v. Rioux, 2004 NBCA 98

Nova Scotia (Community Services) v. A.A., 2009 NSSC 206

Francis v. Baker, 1999 CanlII 659 (SCC)

Glaspy v. Glaspy, 2011 NBCA 101 Bracklow v. Bracklow [1999] S.C.J. 14 Moge v. Moge [1992] S.C.J. 107 Richards v. Richards, 2012 NSCA 7

THIS INFORMATION SHEET DOES NOT FORM PART OF THE COURT'S DECISION. QUOTES MUST BE FROM THE DECISION, NOT THIS LIBRARY SHEET.