
The “officially released” date that appears near the beginning of each opinion is the date the opinion will be published in the Connecticut Law Journal or the date it was released as a slip opinion. The operative date for the beginning of all time periods for filing postopinion motions and petitions for certification is the “officially released” date appearing in the opinion. In no event will any such motions be accepted before the “officially released” date.

All opinions are subject to modification and technical correction prior to official publication in the Connecticut Reports and Connecticut Appellate Reports. In the event of discrepancies between the electronic version of an opinion and the print version appearing in the Connecticut Law Journal and subsequently in the Connecticut Reports or Connecticut Appellate Reports, the latest print version is to be considered authoritative.

The syllabus and procedural history accompanying the opinion as it appears on the Commission on Official Legal Publications Electronic Bulletin Board Service and in the Connecticut Law Journal and bound volumes of official reports are copyrighted by the Secretary of the State, State of Connecticut, and may not be reproduced and distributed without the express written permission of the Commission on Official Legal Publications, Judicial Branch, State of Connecticut.

TEAM RENTAL GROUP, INC. v. ITT HARTFORD
GROUP, INC., ET AL.
(AC 19206)

Lavery, C. J., and Spear and Cretella, Js.

Argued March 28—officially released August 1, 2000

Counsel

Brendan T. Canty, with whom, on the brief, was *Seth J. Antin*, for the appellant (plaintiff).

Andrew J. O’Keefe, with whom were, *Joseph M. Busher, Jr.*, and, on the brief, *Peter K. O’Keefe*, for the appellees (defendants).

PER CURIAM. In this action, the plaintiff, Team Rental Group, Inc., a car rental company, seeks to recover damages from the defendant insurance carriers¹ of Felix Velez, to whom a vehicle had been rented. The vehicle sustained damage when it was involved in an accident while being operated without permission by the grandson of Velez. The defendants allege that the policy of Velez does not afford coverage under the facts here and that they have no liability to the plaintiff. The trial court agreed and rendered a summary judgment for the defendants.

In its thorough analysis of the facts and applicable law, the trial court found that coverage was excluded under the provisions of the policy for damages to a nonowned vehicle rented to Velez for his sole use that was operated by his grandson with no reasonable belief that he was entitled to do so.

The court also examined and rejected the claim of the plaintiff that Velez was covered under that portion of the policy relating to damage to his own auto. We agree.

Our examination of the record and briefs, together with oral argument of the parties, persuades us that the judgment of the trial court should be affirmed. The memorandum of decision of the trial court is detailed, thoughtful and comprehensive. Its analysis is consistent with our applicable law and precedents, and we therefore adopt the court's well reasoned decision. See *Team Rental Group, Inc. v. ITT Hartford Group, Inc.*, 46 Conn. Sup. 480, A.2d (1998). It would serve no useful purpose to repeat the discussion contained therein. See *Keyes v. Pennsylvania General Accident Ins. Co.*, 45 Conn. App. 140, 142, 695 A.2d 548 (1997); *McCommic v. Commissioner of Correction*, 44 Conn. App. 470, 471, 689 A.2d 526 (1997).

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ The other defendant in this action is the Hartford Insurance Company of the Midwest, Inc.