



*Note: In the case title, an asterisk (\*) indicates an appellant and a double asterisk (\*\*) indicates a cross-appellant. Decisions of a three-justice panel are not to be considered as precedent before any tribunal.*

## **ENTRY ORDER**

OCTOBER TERM, 2026

|                              |   |                                  |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Cheryl Grey* v. Shane LaRock | } | APPEALED FROM:                   |
|                              | } | Superior Court, Chittenden Unit, |
|                              | } | Family Division                  |
|                              | } | CASE NO. 20-DM-00653             |
|                              |   | Trial Judge: Dana DiSano         |

In the above-entitled cause, the Clerk will enter:

Mother, self-represented, appeals from the trial court's dismissal of her motion to modify parent-child contact (PCC). The court found that mother failed to demonstrate a real, substantial, or unanticipated change in circumstances that would allow it to modify the existing order. We affirm.

Mother and father are the parents of a daughter, born in March 2016. Pursuant to an October 2024 order, mother had only supervised contact with daughter. Mother moved to modify PCC in March 2025. Following several hearings, the court denied her request. It made findings on the record and supplemented those findings in a December 2025 entry order. Mother appeals.

Mother argues that the court should have found a change in circumstances and allowed her to have unsupervised visitation. We cannot address this argument because mother did not order a transcript of the hearings below. We lack the court's full decision and by failing to order a transcript, mother waived any challenge to sufficiency of the court's findings. See V.R.A.P. 10(b)(1) (explaining that it is appellant's responsibility to order transcript and appellant "waives the right to raise any issue for which a transcript is necessary for informed appellate review"). Without the transcript, we assume that the trial court's findings are supported by the evidence. See *In re S.B.L.*, 150 Vt. 294, 307 (1988); see also *Hoiska v. Town of E. Montpelier*, 2014 VT 80, ¶ 9 n.\*, 197 Vt. 196 (explaining that without transcript, this Court cannot review appellant's challenges to factual findings). We note that mother appears to essentially disagree with the way in which the trial court weighed the evidence. This Court does not reweigh the evidence on appeal. See *Cabot v. Cabot*, 166 Vt. 485, 497 (1997) ("As the trier of fact, it [is] the province of the trial court to determine the credibility of the witnesses and weigh the persuasiveness of the evidence."). Mother fails to show that the court erred in denying her motion to modify.

Affirmed.

BY THE COURT:

---

Harold E. Eaton, Jr., Associate Justice

---

Nancy J. Waples, Associate Justice

---

Christina E. Nolan, Associate Justice