
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.

JOHN LAZORIK ET AL. v. RITA J. DONALDSON
(AC 21250)

Landau, Mihalakos and Shea, Js.

Argued May 30—officially released September 11, 2001

Counsel

Rita J. Donaldson, pro se, the appellant (defendant).

Andre D. Dorval, with whom was *Timothy M. Lodge*, for the appellees (plaintiffs).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. In this foreclosure action, after the parties entered into a stipulated judgment, the defendant, Rita J. Donaldson, filed a motion to reopen the judgment and to extend the law day. The defendant, who is pursuing this appeal pro se, appealed following the trial court’s denial of her motion to reopen.¹ On appeal, the defendant claims that the trial court abused its discretion when, during the hearing on the motion to reopen, it denied her request for additional time to obtain new counsel. We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

We review the court’s decision under an abuse of

discretion standard. See *Chaplin v. Balkus*, 189 Conn. 445, 448–49, 456 A.2d 286 (1983). In the present case, on August 14, 2000, the defendant filed, and the court granted, a motion to open the judgment and to extend the law day. The court extended the law day for one month. Prior to the law day, the defendant filed a motion to reopen the judgment. A few days prior to the hearing on the motion to reopen, the defendant allegedly discovered that her counsel agreed to the aforementioned stipulated judgment without her consent. She immediately discharged her counsel and, at the hearing, requested additional time so that she could hire new counsel. The court denied her request and subsequently denied her motion to reopen.² After carefully reviewing the record and the briefs, we conclude that the court did not abuse its discretion in denying the defendant’s request for additional time to hire new counsel.

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ In her brief and at oral argument, the defendant challenges the propriety of the stipulated judgment. By order of December 19, 2000, this court granted the plaintiffs’ motion to dismiss to the extent that the defendant challenged the stipulated judgment. This court denied the defendant’s motion to reconsider that part of the order on January 24, 2001. Therefore, we will not review any issue challenging the propriety of the stipulated judgment.

² Although the defendant claims that she did not discover her counsel’s impropriety until days before the hearing on the motion to reopen and, therefore, she did not have enough time to hire new counsel, she neither brought an action against her former counsel nor, at the very least, provided any evidence on appeal to support her claim of attorney misconduct.
