NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION EIGHT

CHARLIE ZHAO,	B294131
Plaintiff and Appellant,	(Los Angeles County Super. Ct. No. GD044309)
v.	
SUZIE YOUNG,	
Defendant and Respondent.	

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Christine Byrd, Judge. Affirmed.

Charlie Zhao, in pro. per., for Plaintiff and Appellant.

No appearance for Defendant and Respondent.

* * * * * * * *

This is the third appeal concerning the dissolution of the marriage of husband Charlie Zhao and wife Suzie Young. (*Zhao v. Young* (Feb. 4, 2015, B253721) [nonpub. opn.] (*Zhao I*); *Zhao v. Young* (Oct. 10, 2017, B271103) [nonpub. opn.] (*Zhao II*).) In *Zhao II*, husband challenged the trial court's division of the marital estate and the reimbursement it ordered him to pay to wife.

We affirmed in part and reversed in part. We reversed the court's finding that husband diverted $43,200 to his sister Cindy between 2005 and 2009, and remanded for the trial court to reassess this amount in light of its other findings and to make any adjustments of the division of assets that might be required. We affirmed on all other grounds because the court's other findings were supported by substantial evidence. We expressed no opinion on whether any adjustments must in fact be made. (*Zhao II, supra,* B271103.)

During the trial on remand, husband attempted to discuss the "larger context" of his claimed errors in the judgment, including the trial court's failure to account for his child support payments for his child from a previous marriage. Husband asked the trial court to "re-evaluate the parties' credibility and rewrite [its] decision because . . . this minor adjustment" concerning payments to his sister "will not give [him] justice at all," and argued that the trial court had "very large discretion to redivide . . . community assets." The trial court stated that it only had jurisdiction to reassess the payments to husband's sister.

After hearing from the parties, the trial court took the matter under submission. In its ruling, the court noted that the parties attempted to relitigate many issues exceeding the scope of the limited remand. The court, after considering the "totality of

2

the evidence," concluded no adjustment to the division of assets was required. Husband timely appealed.

In his appellate briefs, husband does not claim any error with the trial court's judgment following remand, or even discuss what occurred upon remand. Instead, he restates the issues raised in *Zhao II*, and makes numerous claims of error regarding this court's resolution of that appeal.

Husband's petition for rehearing in *Zhao II* was denied, as was his petition for review by the California Supreme Court, and his petition for writ of certiorari in the United States Supreme Court. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.268; see also *Zhao II*, *supra,* B271103, rehg. den. Nov. 3, 2017, review den. Jan. 17, 2018, S245449, cert. den. June 11, 2018, No. 17-1410.) Our opinion in *Zhao II* has long been final and we cannot consider husband's claims in this appeal. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.264; *Wilson v. Wilson* (1948) 33 Cal.2d 107, 109-110 [discussing finality of opinions and law of the case doctrine]; *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum, L.P.* (2012) 210 Cal.App.4th 851, 862 [discussing superior court's authority upon limited remand].)

Because husband has not identified any prejudicial error that occurred on remand, we affirm. (*Culbertson v. R. D. Werner Co., Inc.* (1987) 190 Cal.App.3d 704, 710.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed. Respondent is awarded her costs on appeal.

GRIMES, J.

WE CONCUR:

BIGELOW, P. J.   WILEY, J.