
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.

EUGENE A. COLEMAN *v.* COMMISSIONER OF
CORRECTION
(AC 20302)

Schaller, Spear and Mihalakos, Js.

Submitted on briefs June 13—officially released October 16, 2001

Counsel

Patrice A. Cohan, special public defender, for the appellant (petitioner).

Ronald G. Weller, assistant state’s attorney, with whom, on the brief, were *Michael Dearington*, state’s attorney, and *David M. Kutzner*, assistant state’s attorney, for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The petitioner, Eugene A. Coleman, appeals from the judgment of the habeas court denying his petition for a writ of habeas corpus. On appeal, the petitioner claims that the court improperly (1) denied certification to appeal from the denial of his petition for a writ of habeas corpus and (2) abused its discretion in denying the petition.

After a thorough review of the record and briefs,

we conclude that the petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing that he has been denied a state or federal constitutional right and, further, has failed to sustain his burden of persuasion that the denial of certification to appeal from the denial of his habeas corpus petition was a clear abuse of discretion or that an injustice has been done. See *Simms v. Warden*, 230 Conn. 608, 612, 646 A.2d 126 (1994); *Simms v. Warden*, 229 Conn. 178, 189, 640 A.2d 601 (1994); *Pollitt v. Commissioner of Correction*, 60 Conn. App. 743, 746, 760 A.2d 1278 (2000), cert. denied, 255 Conn. 930, 767 A.2d 101 (2001); see also *Lozada v. Deeds*, 498 U.S. 430, 431–32, 111 S. Ct. 860, 112 L. Ed. 2d 956 (1991).

The appeal is dismissed.
