

Wednesday.

{¶13} On March 12, 2008, appellant filed a motion for custody in this matter after learning that B.H.-S. had been allegedly molested by his half-brother. On October 16, 2008, mother filed a motion for increase in child support based upon an increase in salary of appellant and mother being laid off from her job.

{¶14} Following a hearing, the trial court issued a written decision denying father's motion for a change of custody. The court concluded that, although the molestation suffered by B.H.-S was traumatic and "certainly constitutes a change in circumstances," a change in custody "would be detrimental." The court found that mother had addressed safety concerns by separating B.H.-S. and the perpetrator, requiring his half-brother to live with his paternal grandmother. The court also stated that B.H.-S. was involved in counseling and is doing well in school.

{¶15} The court also ordered recalculation of child support by the Butler County Child Support Enforcement Agency (CSEA) based upon the father's new salary and imputing mother with an income of minimum wage. Appellant timely appeals, raising two assignments of error.

{¶16} Assignment of Error No. 1:

{¶17} "THE COURT'S DECISION TO OVERRULE APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR CUSTODY IS AGAINST THE MANIFEST WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE."

{¶18} Assignment of Error No. 2:

{¶19} "THE TRIAL COURT ABUSED ITS DISCRETION WITH RESPECT TO ITS CHILD SUPPORT ORDER."

{¶110} In his first assignment of error, appellant argues that the trial court's custody decision was against the manifest weight of the evidence. Under his second assignment of error, appellant argues that the trial court abused its discretion with

respect to the child support order.

{¶11} Before we address the merits of the instant appeal, we must determine whether this court has jurisdiction. It is well-established that appellate courts have jurisdiction to review only final appealable orders from lower courts. *In re Adams*, 115 Ohio St.3d 86, 2007-Ohio-4840, ¶26. The trial court in this case referred the matter to the CSEA to calculate the amount of child support. There is no indication in the record that the amount has been determined. *Robinson v. Robinson*, Summit App. No. 21440, 2003-Ohio-5049, ¶7. "[W]here the amount of child support is ambiguous, or left to be calculated at a later date, there is no final appealable order because the order contemplates further action by the trial court." *Coleman v. Vickers*, Vinton App. No. 480, 1993 WL 120657, *1. See, also, *State ex rel. Jackson Cty. Child Support Enforcement Agency v. Long*, Jackson App. No. 00CA15, 2002-Ohio-408. Since the amount of child support remains pending, no final appealable order exists in this case and, as a result, we are without jurisdiction.

{¶12} Appeal dismissed.

BRESSLER, P.J., and HENDRICKSON, J., concur.