# What the guidelines actually produce — and why the 2025 dip is noise

**Matter:** Cyganovich v. Cyganovich, FST-FA16-5015729-S

**Prepared:** July 28, 2026 · **Hearing:** August 18, 2026

**Current order:** $225 per week (March 5, 2018)

## 1. The revised guidelines govern this hearing

**Regulation of the Commission for Child Support Guidelines, concerning the Child Support and Arrearage Guidelines.**

- Secretary of the State file number **6462**
- Connecticut eRegulations System tracking number **PR2025-021**, posted **March 11, 2026**
- Approved by the Attorney General **December 22, 2025**
- Approved by the Legislative Regulation Review Committee **February 24, 2026**
- **Effective August 1, 2026**

The hearing is **August 18, 2026 — seventeen days after the revision takes effect.** The revised schedule governs, not the one under which the 2018 order was calculated.

The change that matters here: **the schedule now runs to $6,000 of combined weekly net income**, where it previously stopped at $4,000. This family's combined net is roughly **$5,060 to $5,390 per week**. Under the old schedule they were above the top row and the number had to be extrapolated; under the revised schedule they sit **on the table**, and the presumptive amount is simply read off it.

Local copy: `guidelines_change_2026/CT_CS_Guidelines_FinalApproved_PR2025-021_eff_2026-08-01.pdf`

## 2. His income is far above the 2018 baseline

He is moving to reduce support on the strength of a 2% dip between 2024 and 2025. Set against the order he is asking the court to change, that dip is noise.

| | Wages | Against the 2018 order |
|---|---|---|
| 2017 — the year before the order | $164,380 | baseline |
| 2018 — the order year | $186,023 | — |
| **2025** | **$201,949** | **+$37,569 on 2017, +22.9%** |
| **2026 Moinian base salary** | **$220,000** | **+$55,620 on 2017, +33.8%** |

His 2026 salary is more than a third above what he earned the year before the order he now says is too high. The 2024→2025 movement is –**$3,965**.

## 3. What the revised schedule produces

Kate's net weekly income: **$2,308.78**, taken from her **April 29, 2026 affidavit**. See the caveat in section 4 — this figure has **not** been recomputed as a guideline net.

Thomas is run four ways. The two "actual stub" rows correct the tax overstatement on his affidavit: his Josephson/Moinian stub for check #1478 dated 1/30/2026 shows real weekly withholding of **$1,147.78** against the **$1,514.07** he swore to, because every figure on his affidavit was computed on Columbia-era deductions and two exemptions he no longer claims.

| Scenario | Tom net/wk | Combined | Split | **Presumptive** | At the 2018 deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| As he swore it, no deduction claimed | $2,751.77 | $5,060.55 | 54 / 46 | **$372** | $317 |
| As he swore it, deduction for two | $2,229.10 | $4,537.88 | 49 / 51 | **$328** | $279 |
| **Actual stub taxes, health insurance deducted, no qualified-child deduction** | **$2,928.66** | **$5,237.44** | **56 / 44** | **$392** | **$334** |
| Actual stub taxes, health insurance deducted, deduction for two | $2,383.33 | $4,692.11 | 51 / 49 | **$344** | $293 |

**Every scenario exceeds the $225 he currently pays.** The range is **$328 to $392**, and even applying the same 14.77% downward deviation the court itself used in 2018, **$279 to $334**. He has moved to reduce an order the guidelines say should rise by between **46% and 74%**.

### *Correction, later on July 28*

An earlier version of this memo put the two stub rows at **$406** and **$354**. Those figures took the stub's net of $3,082.99 at face value. **That stub predates his health coverage** — the check is dated 1/30/2026 and Moinian coverage began 2/1/2026, so its deductions column reads $0.00. Health insurance of about **$154.33 per week** is an allowable deduction under § 46b-215a-1(1)(D) and has to come out. The corrected figures are **$392** and **$344**. Do not use the earlier pair.

## 4. What these figures do NOT yet correct — read before relying on them

**Thomas's side is corrected. Kate's is not.**

His tax overstatement is handled: the stub rows use his real withholding. What is **not** handled is Kate's figure. **$2,308.78 is the net stated on her own affidavit**, not a guideline net recomputed under § 46b-215a-1(11). Two things could move it:

- **If her affidavit understates her tax**, her true guideline net is lower than $2,308.78.
- **The family health premium is paid through Ben's payroll, not Kate's.** It is not a deduction from *her* income under the guidelines, whatever it shows about who insures Scarlett.
- She has **Schedule C self-employment income** (Flutes & Foam / HoneyBook). Self-employment is computed differently under § 46b-215a-1(11)(A)(iii) — gross receipts less ordinary and necessary business expenses — so an affidavit net may not be the guideline net at all.

**Which way does it move the number? Up.** Lowering Kate's net raises Thomas's share of the combined income, and his share is what he pays:

| Kate's guideline net | Combined | Split | Presumptive |
|---|---|---|---|
| $2,308.78 (as her affidavit states) | $5,237.44 | 56 / 44 | **$392** |
| less $100 | $5,137.44 | 57 / 43 | **$395** |
| less $200 | $5,037.44 | 58 / 42 | **$399** |
| less $300 | $4,937.44 | 59 / 41 | **$404** |

So the two corrections pull against each other and roughly cancel. Deducting Thomas's health insurance took $392 off the top; correcting Kate's net downward puts it back. **The answer stays in the $390 to $405 band either way**, which is the useful thing: the conclusion does not depend on resolving either question.

**To finish this properly I need Kate's April 29, 2026 affidavit gross and her itemised deductions**, plus the Schedule C net for Flutes & Foam. Until then, present $392 as the working figure and say it is computed on her affidavit net.

## 5. Kate should claim her own qualified-child deduction

Counter-intuitive but worth the ten minutes:

On the corrected figures:

| | Combined | Split | Presumptive |
|---|---|---|---|
| Only Thomas claims it | $4,692.11 | 51 / 49 | $344 |
| **Both parents claim it** | **$4,393.11** | **54 / 46** | **$358** |

Claiming it **raises** the presumptive by $14 per week, because it moves the income split from 51/49

to 54/46 — and 51/49 is precisely the parity he needs. It also removes his route to the "substantially equal income" deviation under

§ 46b-215a-5c(b)(6)(A)(iii), which is the only shared-custody deviation criterion that stands alone

and needs no proof about expenses.

Kate qualifies: Atticus, and she is **defending** his pending motion, which is what

§ 46b-215a-2c(d)(1)(B) requires. Claiming it is consistent with arguing that Thomas may not use it, because the regulation makes it a shield for a parent defending a modification, never a sword for the parent moving to reduce.

## 6. How to put it at the hearing

1. **The revision governs.** August 1, 2026, PR2025-021, and the hearing is August 18.
2. **The family is now on the schedule, not above it.** Combined net of roughly $5,060 to $5,390 sits inside the new $6,000 ceiling; no extrapolation is required.
3. **Run his actual Moinian figures, not the affidavit.** Real withholding of $1,147.78, not the $1,514.07 he swore to — but deduct his health insurance, which the 1/30/2026 stub predates.

4. **The presumptive is about $392.** He pays $225. His motion asks for less than that.
5. **If a shared-custody deviation is applied at the same 14.77% the court used in 2018**, the number is still about $334.

*Figures maintained in `case_facts/facts.json`; worksheet computed against the certified schedule effective August 1, 2026.*