

own independent factual findings and legal conclusions. *Id.* at 113; *Iturribarria Perez v. Bazaldua Garcia*, 148 Wn. App. 131, 138, 198 P.3d 539 (2009); *Grieco v. Wilson*, 144 Wn. App. 865, 877, 184 P.3d 668 (2008), *aff'd in part sub nom. In re Custody of E.A.T.W.*, 168 Wn.2d 335, 227 P.3d 1284 (2010). Any subsequent appeal to this court is one that reviews the decision of the superior court judge, not the commissioner. *Ramer*, 151 Wn.2d at 113.

■ ¶9 Given the foregoing analysis, it is apparent the superior court judge had authority not only to reverse the commissioner's decision regarding whether Ms. Lyle had established grounds for modification but also to provide an appropriate remedy. The judge could have remanded the case to the commissioner had the factual record been incomplete. *In re Marriage of Moody*, 137 Wn.2d 979, 992, 976 P.2d 1240 (1999). But doing so was not required. Because the factual record was complete, the superior court judge had full jurisdiction to decide Ms. Lyle's child support modification petition in its entirety. By exercising complete authority over the matter, the judge appropriately placed Ms. Lyle on equal footing with litigants whose cases are handled by superior court judges in their entirety. Remand to the commissioner for entry of child support orders would have been inefficient and contrary to the fundamental goals of the court commissioner process.

¶10 Mr. Lyle complains that the superior court judge's determination deprived him of an opportunity to argue for a deviation from the standard child support schedule. We are unpersuaded. The ultimate issue before both the commissioner and the judge was Ms. Lyle's request for child support payments based on her proposed child support work sheet.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Lyle was provided ample opportunity to resist Ms. Lyle's request in its entirety. Yet he never specifically requested a deviation. Instead, he focused on the foundational issue of whether Ms. Lyle had presented a

---

<sup>2</sup> Prior to modification, neither parent had been obliged to make support payments, as the parents had entered into a shared parenting plan.