
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.

ROBERT LITTLEFIELD *v.* COMMISSIONER OF
CORRECTION
(AC 19215)

O’Connell, C. J., and Hennessy and Zarella, Js.¹

Argued February 22—officially released August 22, 2000

Counsel

David B. Rozwaski, for the appellant (petitioner).

James E. Ralls, assistant state’s attorney, with whom, on the brief, were *John Bailey*, chief state’s attorney, and *Kimberley Perrelli*, assistant state’s attorney, for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The petitioner, Robert Littlefield, appeals from the habeas court’s denial of his amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Following a review of the record and briefs and after hearing the parties at oral argument, we conclude that the petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing that he has been denied a state or federal constitutional right. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the habeas court.

On February 9, 1995, the petitioner pleaded guilty to

six charges in two files.² He was sentenced to a total effective sentence of twenty-five years, suspended after thirteen years, with seven years probation. In 1998, the petitioner filed an amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus, alleging that he had been denied effective assistance of trial counsel. Specifically, the petitioner alleged that trial counsel failed to advise him adequately regarding his decision to plead guilty and failed to move to suppress his confessions based on the petitioner's allegations of coercion. Following trial, the habeas court denied the petition.

The habeas court's denial of the petitioner's writ was predicated on a factual review of the petitioner's claim. "This court does not retry the case or evaluate the credibility of witnesses. . . . Rather, we must defer to the [trier of fact's] assessment of the credibility of witnesses based on its firsthand observation of their conduct, demeanor and attitude." (Citation omitted; internal quotation marks omitted.) *State v. McClam*, 44 Conn. App. 198, 208, 689 A.2d 475, cert. denied, 240 Conn. 912, 690 A.2d 400 (1997).

In a thoughtful and comprehensive memorandum of decision, the habeas court analyzed the petitioner's claim and the law applicable thereto. *Littlefield v. Commissioner of Correction*, 46 Conn. Sup. 495, A.2d (1998). Because the habeas court's memorandum of decision fully addresses the issues raised in this appeal, we adopt it as a proper statement of the facts and the applicable law. It would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained therein. See *Diggs v. Commissioner of Correction*, 57 Conn. App. 734, 750 A.2d 1151 (2000). We conclude that the habeas court had before it sufficient evidence to find as it did.

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ The listing of judges reflects their seniority status on this court as of the date of oral argument.

² In file CR94-53505, the petitioner pleaded guilty to arson in the first degree in violation of General Statutes § 53a-111 (a) (1), reckless endangerment in the first degree in violation of General Statutes § 53a-63, and risk of injury to a child in violation of General Statutes § 53-21.

In file CR94-53404, the petitioner pleaded guilty to sexual assault in the second degree in violation of General Statutes § 53a-71, sexual assault in the fourth degree in violation of General Statutes § 53a-73a, and risk of injury to a child in violation of General Statutes § 53-21.
