
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.

LANDAU, J., concurring. I fully agree with the majority’s conclusions as to the defendant’s first three claims. With respect to the fourth claim, however, while I agree with the result reached by the majority, I respectfully assert that the defendant is not entitled to review of his claim.

Pursuant to Practice Book § 61-10, the appellant is required to provide an adequate record for review. The record in this case does not include a written memorandum of decision issued by the court or a signed transcript of the court’s oral decision on the motion to open. The majority, citing *State v. Lavigne*, 57 Conn. App. 463, 468 n.4, 749 A.2d 83 (2000), concludes, however, that because a portion of the transcripts indicates the basis for the court’s decision respecting the defendant’s motion to open, the defendant is entitled to review of his claim. I respectfully disagree.

Here, as in *Lavigne*, the court neither issued a written memorandum of decision, nor signed a transcript of its oral decision. An unsigned portion of the transcript does, however, reveal the basis for the court’s decision. In *Lavigne*, the appellant, as required by Practice Book § 67-4 (c), included in his statement of the facts citations

to the pages of the transcript where the court discussed the basis for its decision. Furthermore, the appellant included copies of those transcript pages in his appendix. Therefore, this court did not have to search the record to find the basis for the trial court's decision. Here, however, the plaintiff violated Practice Book § 67-4 (c) by not including citations to the transcript in his brief and by failing to attach copies of the transcript to an appendix.

Before exercising its supervisory powers to excuse the plaintiff's failure to provide this court with an adequate record, the majority was forced to search the record to find the basis for the court's decision. And while the exercise of our "supervisory authority is a necessary adjunct of appellate jurisdiction that is used to facilitate business and advance justice . . . [it] does not allow litigants to circumvent other rules of practice designed to promote judicial efficiency and justice." (Citations omitted; internal quotation marks omitted.) *State v. Piorkowski*, 37 Conn. App. 252, 265, 656 A.2d 1046 (1995), rev'd on other grounds, 236 Conn. 388, 672 A.2d 921 (1996). Where, as here, an appellant fails to follow the most basic rules established to guarantee the presentation of an adequate record, this court should not exercise its supervisory powers to afford the appellant review of his claim. *Holmes v. Holmes*, 32 Conn. App. 317, 322, 629 A.2d 1137, cert. denied, 228 Conn. 902, 634 A.2d 295 (1993). Therefore, for the reasons discussed, I believe that the logic of *Lavigne* does not apply and that the defendant is not entitled to review of his claim.
