

**STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA**  
**SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS**

**Michael King**  
**Petitioner Below, Petitioner**

v.) **No. 25-356** (ICA No. 24-ICA-392)

**Lurinda King**  
**Respondent Below, Respondent**

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Petitioner Michael King appeals the memorandum decision of the Intermediate Court of Appeals (“ICA”) affirming the Family Court of Webster County’s August 29, 2024, final divorce order granting, in part, the respondent’s motion to reconsider the prior final divorce order.<sup>1</sup> *See King v. King*, No. 24-ICA-392, 2025 WL 1249559 (W. Va. Ct. App. Apr. 29, 2025) (memorandum decision). On appeal, the petitioner challenges the family court’s award of alimony and attorney’s fees to the respondent and the ICA’s affirmance of that award.

On December 1, 2023, the family court granted the parties a divorce in a final order equitably distributing their assets, awarding spousal support to the respondent, and denying attorney fees. Thereafter, both parties filed motions to reconsider the final order. The family court took up those motions and, as a result, entered another final divorce order on August 29, 2024, increasing the alimony the petitioner was to remit to the respondent and awarding the respondent attorney’s fees. The petitioner appealed this ruling to the ICA, which affirmed the family court’s ruling. *Id.*

On appeal of a family court’s final order from the ICA, this Court reviews the family court’s findings of fact for clear error, the family court’s application of the law to the facts for an abuse of discretion, and questions of law de novo. Syl. Pt. 3, *Christopher P. v. Amanda C.*, 250 W. Va. 53, 902 S.E.2d 185 (2024). Before this Court, the petitioner first contends that the family court erred by increasing the respondent’s lump sum alimony and permanent alimony, a recalculation the family court explained was necessary based upon his earlier lack of candor regarding his health and earning capacity. The respondent counters that the petitioner is simply asking this Court to reweigh the family court’s credibility determinations. The petitioner also argues that the family court erred by awarding the respondent attorney’s fees and that its ruling in this regard is unreviewable due to the order being conclusory and lacking legal analysis. The respondent replies that the petitioner misconstrues the family court’s findings and that it performed

---

<sup>1</sup> The petitioner appears by counsel Christopher T. Pritt. The respondent appears by counsel Jared S. Frame.

the requisite analysis. Having considered the record and the briefs, we find no reversible error and therefore summarily affirm the ICA's decision. *See* W. Va. R. App. P. 21(c).

Affirmed.

**ISSUED:** June 1, 2026

**CONCURRED IN BY:**

Chief Justice C. Haley Bunn  
Justice William R. Wooton  
Justice Charles S. Trump IV  
Justice Thomas H. Ewing  
Justice Gerald M. Titus III