

*This opinion is nonprecedential except as provided by
Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 136.01, subd. 1(c).*

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS
A25-1912**

Sarah Nicole Belich and on Behalf of Minor Child(ren), petitioner,
Respondent,

vs.

Bradley Thomas Belich,
Appellant.

**Filed May 11, 2026
Affirmed
Worke, Judge**

Anoka County District Court
File No. 02-FA-24-2011

Emmalie H. Brudzinski, St. Paul, Minnesota (for respondent)

Bradley Thomas Belich, Maple Grove, Minnesota (pro se appellant)

Considered and decided by Bratvold, Presiding Judge; Worke, Judge; and Ross,
Judge.

NONPRECEDENTIAL OPINION

WORKE, Judge

Appellant challenges the district court's order denying his motion for relief under
Minn. R. Civ. P. 60.02 in this order-for-protection (OFP) matter. We affirm.

FACTS

Twice in late 2024, appellant Bradley Thomas Belich¹ committed domestic abuse against his wife, respondent Sarah Nicole Belich, leading her to obtain an OFP. In March 2025, Bradley appealed the issuance of the OFP.

In July 2025, while the appeal was pending, Bradley moved the district court for relief under Minn. R. Civ. P. 60.02, alleging that the OFP was based on “false and misleading information,” and that “[n]ewly discovered evidence” contradicted Sarah’s testimony at the OFP hearing. Bradley also alleged that the district court violated his right to his emotional-support animal, improperly granted Sarah custody of the parties’ children, and was biased against him. This court stayed the appeal and remanded to the district court to consider Bradley’s rule 60.02 motion.

At a hearing on the motion, Bradley argued to the district court that Sarah had misrepresented to the district court the status of his emotional-support animal. He claimed that the district court made rulings based on his demeanor and that his demeanor was only destabilized because he had been removed from his emotional-support animal. Bradley also claimed that he had evidence supporting his position that he did not injure Sarah. Bradley explained that he did not obtain the evidence before trial because he was in “survival mode” and did not realize that he needed corroborating evidence.

In September 2025, the district court denied relief. The district court determined that Bradley’s claimed newly discovered evidence disproving Sarah’s testimony—a

¹ The parties’ first names will be used because they share a surname.

Facetime log, a call log from his phone, and other proof of phone calls—was known to Bradley at the time of trial and could have been presented then. The district court also concluded that Bradley failed to show that Sarah made material misrepresentations to the court regarding his emotional-support animal.

After the stay of the appeal was dissolved, this court affirmed the district court’s grant of the OFP. *See Belich v. Belich*, No. A25-0415, 2026 WL 191760 (Minn. App. Jan. 26, 2026). Bradley had argued that Sarah failed to prove that he committed domestic abuse. *Id.* at *2. This court noted that the district court found Sarah to be credible and had corroborating photographic evidence. *Id.* Bradley had also argued that the district court was biased because it prejudged the case before hearing any evidence and told Bradley, “I don’t believe you.” *Id.* at *3. This court determined that the context demonstrated that the district court was managing Bradley’s conduct and disruptive behavior. *Id.* Bradley had also argued that the district court violated his right to cross-examine witnesses, violated the Americans with Disabilities Act, cut off witnesses and guided witnesses on how to answer questions, became angry and impatient about continuing the OFP hearing, demonstrated bias based on several evidentiary decisions, misinterpreted testimony, ignored favorable evidence, credited unfavorable evidence, and disregarded corroborating stories and call logs. *Id.* at *4-6. This court determined that Bradley failed to show bias. *Id.* at *6.

Bradley’s appeal of the district court’s denial of his rule 60.02 motion followed.

DECISION

Bradley raises several challenges in this appeal; specifically, he argues that (1) the record does not support the OFP and the district court failed to consider all of the evidence and improperly weighed evidence; (2) the district court should have reopened the OFP under rule 60.02; (3) the district court failed to make findings to support the custody award in the OFP; (4) the district court denied him due process and was biased against him; and (5) Sarah's witnesses at the OFP hearing were coached. With one exception, these issues have been addressed in Bradley's appeal of the district court's issuance of the OFP. *See id.* at *2-6. We will review only whether the district court properly denied rule 60.02 relief.

This court reviews the denial of a rule 60.02 motion for an abuse of discretion. *In re Welfare of Child. of Coats*, 633 N.W.2d 505, 510 (Minn. 2001). A district court abuses its discretion if its findings of fact are unsupported by the record or if it improperly applies the law. *Honke v. Honke*, 960 N.W.2d 261, 265 (Minn. 2021).

Under rule 60.02, a district court may order relief if it determines that the requested relief is supported by newly discovered evidence, "which by due diligence could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial pursuant to Rule 59.03." Minn. R. Civ. P. 60.02(b). A district court may also order requested relief if the original judgment was based on "[f]raud (whether heretofore denominated intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or other misconduct of an adverse party." *Id.*(c).

Bradley had argued to the district court that newly discovered evidence—a Facetime log, a call log from his phone, and other proof of phone calls made during and after the

domestic abuse—justified vacating the OFP. But, as the district court correctly concluded, Bradley did not present newly discovered evidence.

Newly discovered evidence is evidence that could not have been discovered in time for the trial. *See id.*(b). As the district court stated, Bradley could have obtained the evidence before trial, especially the evidence that is on his phone. Bradley does not explain why he could not have obtained the evidence before the OFP hearing. Instead, he asserts that the evidence does not support the issuance of the OFP and challenges the district court’s weighing of evidence. But we must defer to a district court’s credibility determinations. *Vangsness v. Vangsness*, 607 N.W.2d 468, 472 (Minn. App. 2000). And we do not reweigh the evidence, reconcile conflicting evidence, or engage in new fact-finding. *In re Civ. Commitment of Kenney*, 963 N.W.2d 214, 221-22 (Minn. 2021). The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Bradley’s rule 60.02 motion to reopen the OFP record based on his claim of newly discovered evidence.

Bradley also argued that the OFP record should have been reopened based on Sarah’s misrepresentations. At the hearing, Bradley argued that Sarah misled the court into believing that Bradley was more dangerous than he is. It seems that he claimed that Sarah kept him from his emotional-support dog, and his emotional-support dog deescalates his behavior. But, as the district court found, there is nothing in the record to show that Sarah misrepresented Bradley’s dangerousness. The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Bradley’s rule 60.02 motion.

Affirmed.