

[REDACTED]

of good faith. *Crowe v. Trickey*, 204 U.S. 228, 239 (1907); *Buttorff v. United Electronic Laboratories, Inc.*, 459 S.W.2d 581, 585-86 (Ky. App. 1970); 2 A. CORBIN, CONTRACTS § 446, at 552 (1950).

*Affirmed.*

[REDACTED]

Hillsborough  
No. 81-190  
No. 81-198

JOANN P.

v.

GARY W.

February 12, 1982

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

*Stanton E. Tefft*, of Bedford (*Daniel J. Harkinson* on the brief and orally), for the plaintiff.

*Hanrahan & Michael*, of Bedford (*John W. Hanrahan* on the brief and orally), for the defendant.

BATCHELDER, J. The defendant has appealed an order of the Superior Court (*Dalianis*, J.) requiring him to pay \$100 each week through the New Hampshire Probation Department for the support of the parties' minor child who was born out of wedlock. He was further ordered to pay the sum of \$2,568.56 for expenses in connection with the plaintiff's prenatal care and delivery of the child. The court's authority is contained in RSA ch. 168-A, which clearly spells out that in this State the father of a child born of unwed parents is "liable to the same extent as the father of a child born in wedlock . . . for the reasonable expenses of the mother's pregnancy and confinement and for the education and necessary support of the child. . . ." RSA 168-A:1.

The plaintiff cross-appeals an order that denies her motion to make the support order retroactive to the birth of the child. We affirm the trial court on both issues.

The defendant's contention in this appeal is that his obligation to support the child should not include support for the mother and that the weekly amount ordered necessarily provides support for the mother and is, therefore, an abuse of discretion.

At the time of the hearing, the plaintiff and her infant daughter were renting one room of a house with a family in Braintree, Massachusetts, sharing kitchen and bathroom facilities. Moreover, they were required to vacate that house within a month to six weeks after the hearing. At the time, the plaintiff was receiving AFDC benefits from Massachusetts, although she was seeking employment and suitable living quarters in southern New Hampshire. She has a high school equivalency and has never earned more than the minimum wage.

■ The defendant, at the time of hearing, was employed part-time (about twenty hours weekly) as a waiter earning approxi-

