

Commonwealth of Kentucky
Court of Appeals

NO. 2026-CA-0380-ME

J.T.P.W.

APPELLANT

v. APPEAL FROM JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT
HONORABLE JESSICA STONE, JUDGE
ACTION NO. 24-J-504447

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
EX REL. K.L.G.

APPELLEE

OPINION
AFFIRMING

** ** *

BEFORE: THOMPSON, CHIEF JUDGE; CALDWELL AND CETRULO,
JUDGES.

THOMPSON, CHIEF JUDGE: J.T.P.W.¹ (Appellant), *pro se*, appeals from
Judgment of Paternity and Orders of Support entered by the Jefferson Circuit Court
on March 20, 2026. Appellant argues that the circuit court erred in its calculation

¹ We will refer to certain people using their initials as this matter involves child paternity.

of child support, as the calculation is not supported by the record. After careful review, we find no error and affirm the judgment and orders on appeal.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On November 15, 2024, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Cabinet for Health and Family Services (the Cabinet) filed a Paternity Complaint in Jefferson Circuit Court on behalf of K.L.G. (Mother). The Complaint asserted that child K.G. (Child) was born out of wedlock in January, 2022, and that Appellant and Mother were the biological parents of Child. Per Kentucky Revised Statutes (KRS) Chapter 406, the Cabinet sought a declaration that Appellant was Child's biological father. It also sought reasonable child support and an order for medical support. Mother filed affidavits in support of the Complaint, including an affidavit that Appellant was Child's biological father. Appellant filed a *pro se* response.

On September 22, 2025, the Jefferson Circuit Court entered an Order of Genetic Testing. Appellant then moved to suspend the Cabinet's testing, so that an independent laboratory could conduct the test. The court denied Appellant's request by way of a calendar order entered on November 3, 2025. In support of the order, the court ruled that the Cabinet's contract for bulk DNA testing was substantially more cost efficient than private testing.

Thereafter, the Cabinet's testing entity, DNA Diagnostics Center in Butler County, Ohio, conducted the paternity test. It produced a report, signed by

the laboratory director, showing a probability of Appellant's paternity of 99.9999998%.

On March 3, 2026, the Jefferson Circuit Court conducted a hearing on the Complaint. At that time, Appellant appeared via Zoom but could not be sworn in because his video feed was not working. The circuit court entered a calendar order noting that Appellant "does not deny paternity of the child," and had filed custody action No. 26-CI-500542. Appellant was ordered to appear in person on March 17, 2026, for an additional hearing. Appellant, continuing *pro se*, responded with a filing declaring that he had not been given a meaningful right to be heard, and asserting various violations of the constitutions of the United States and Kentucky.

However, at the hearing on March 17, 2026, the Appellant did appear in person. At that time, the court imputed to Appellant an income of \$17 per hour. Based on a child support worksheet, the court entered a calendar order directing Appellant to pay \$553.41 per month in child support, including arrearages from November 15, 2024.

Thereafter, the Jefferson Circuit Court entered a Judgment of Paternity and Orders of Support on March 20, 2026, which memorialized the court's prior findings and orders. The circuit court found that Appellant was properly served and summoned; that evidence was adduced at the hearing in

support of the judgment; that Appellant is the biological father of Child; that Appellant and Mother were entitled to joint custody; and, that Mother was entitled to child support in the amount of \$553.41 per month, plus arrearages. This appeal followed.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

“As are most other aspects of domestic relations law, the establishment, modification, and enforcement of child support are prescribed in their general contours by statute and are largely left, within the statutory parameters, to the sound discretion of the trial court. This discretion is far from unlimited.” *Van Meter v. Smith*, 14 S.W.3d 569, 572 (Ky. App. 2000) (citations omitted). “The test for abuse of discretion is whether the trial judge’s decision was arbitrary, unreasonable, unfair, or unsupported by sound legal principles.” *Commonwealth v. English*, 993 S.W.2d 941, 945 (Ky. 1999).

ANALYSIS

Appellant, *pro se*, argues that the Jefferson Circuit Court erred in its March 20, 2026 Judgment of Paternity and Orders of Support. Specifically, Appellant argues that there are “disputed service issues, returned mail references, and filings challenging service.” He also asserts that there were no video recordings of the March 17, 2026 hearing, and that there was no evidentiary basis for the imputed income calculation or the child support calculation. Based on

these claims, Appellant seeks an opinion vacating the judgment and orders on appeal. The Cabinet has not filed a responsive brief.

Appellant has attempted to comply with Kentucky Rules of Appellate Procedure (RAP) 32 regarding the organization and structure of briefs. While his written argument does contain the required sections set out in RAP 32, his argument is best described as a list of grievances with little to no persuasive arguments supported by the record and the law. For example, Appellant states that “unresolved factual disputes existed concerning notice and service before entry of judgment[,]” but does not state what those factual disputes are nor how they might be resolved in his favor. He also asserts that he “requested preservation and production of audio/video materials associated with the proceedings[,]” but again does not reveal what materials are missing nor how they might support reversal of the judgment on appeal.

We have closely examined the record and the law in search of error. Having found none, we have no basis for reversing the judgment and orders on appeal. The record amply demonstrates the following: that the Cabinet properly initiated these proceedings in conformity with KRS Chapter 406; that Appellant was correctly served and summoned; that he was availed of the opportunity to retain counsel had he so chosen; and, that the Cabinet’s DNA testing entity found Appellant to be the biological father of Child with a high degree of certainty.

Further, a calendar order is found in the record with the court's handwritten notation that Appellant did not deny paternity and had instituted a separate custody proceeding. In addition, Appellant appeared at the hearing where evidence was adduced, including the statutory child support work sheet. And finally, we find no basis for concluding that the circuit court's imputation to Appellant of \$17 per hour employment constituted an abuse of discretion per *English*. See *Howard v. Howard*, 336 S.W.3d 433, 439 (Ky. 2011).

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, we find no error and affirm the Jefferson Circuit Court's Judgment of Paternity and Orders of Support.

ALL CONCUR.

BRIEF FOR APPELLANT:

NO BRIEF FOR APPELLEE.

J.T.P.W., *pro se*
Louisville, Kentucky