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# Article summary:

1. Appellee Susan Randolph filed two motions in an appeal of a final judgment of dissolution of marriage and an order awarding attorney's fees.

2. The first motion sought an award of interim attorney's fees and costs pending appeal, which was granted based on the criteria set forth in previous cases.

3. The second motion sought an order from the court relinquishing jurisdiction to the trial court to enter orders enforcing the final judgment currently on appeal, which was also granted as the lower court had incorrectly concluded it lacked jurisdiction to enforce its orders and judgments.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article reports on a case involving a final judgment of dissolution of marriage and an order awarding attorney's fees. The appellee, Susan Randolph, filed two motions seeking an award of interim attorney's fees and costs pending appeal and an order from the court relinquishing jurisdiction to the trial court to enter orders enforcing the final judgment currently on appeal.

The article appears to be unbiased in its reporting of the facts of the case. It provides details about the lower court's findings that led to the awarding of attorney's fees to Randolph and explains why she is entitled to an interim award of appellate attorney's fees and costs based on previous cases.

However, there are some potential biases in the article. For example, it only presents Randolph's side of the argument regarding her entitlement to attorney's fees and does not explore any counterarguments that may have been made by her ex-husband or his legal team. Additionally, while it notes that the lower court denied a stay of its order awarding fees, it does not provide any information about why this decision was made or whether there were any objections raised by her ex-husband.

Furthermore, while the article correctly points out that the trial court has jurisdiction to enforce its orders and judgments even when they are being appealed, it does not explore any potential risks or downsides associated with this approach. For example, if Randolph's ex-husband ultimately prevails on appeal, he may be forced to pay back any attorney's fees awarded during this time period.

Overall, while the article provides a detailed account of Randolph's motions for attorney's fees and enforcement orders, it could benefit from exploring more fully both sides' arguments and considering potential risks associated with enforcing judgments during appeals.

# Topics for further research:

* Risks of enforcing judgments during appeals
* Counterarguments against awarding attorney's fees to Susan Randolph
* Objections raised by Randolph's ex-husband regarding the denial of a stay
* Precedents for interim awards of appellate attorney's fees and costs
* Factors considered by courts when awarding attorney's fees in divorce cases
* Appellate court's authority to review and potentially overturn lower court's decisions on attorney's fees
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