
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.

GERTRUDE T. BERGEN *v.* MICHAEL BELFONTI
(AC 21299)

Schaller, Mihalakos and Shea, Js.

Argued November 28, 2001—officially released January 1, 2002

Counsel

Eric R. Gaynor, for the appellant (defendant).

Robert C. Lubus, Jr., with whom, on the brief, was *Dana B. Lee*, for the appellees (substitute plaintiffs).¹

Opinion

PER CURIAM. This is an appeal brought by the defendant, Michael Belfonti, from the judgment of the trial court ordering payments of \$500 per week on a judgment against him in the amount of \$634,376.97.

The defendant raises four issues on appeal.² The substance of these claims is that the evidence adduced at the hearing did not support the court’s imposition of an order of \$500 weekly payments.

Our examination of the record and briefs and our consideration of the arguments of the parties persuade us that the judgment of the court should be affirmed. The issues regarding the underlying factual dispute

were resolved properly in the trial court's thoughtful and comprehensive memorandum of decision. See *Bergen v. Belfonti*, 47 Conn. Sup. 291, A.2d (2000). Because that memorandum of decision fully addresses the arguments raised in this appeal, we adopt it as a proper statement of the facts and the applicable law on those issues. It would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained therein. See *In re Karrlo K.*, 40 Conn. App. 73, 75, 668 A.2d 1353 (1996).

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ During the pendency of this action, the plaintiff, Gertrude T. Bergen, died, and Claudia Bergen and Paula Bergen, coexecutrices of the plaintiff's estate, were substituted as plaintiffs.

² The defendant's statement of the issues presented on appeal is:

"1. Did the Trial Court err in granting Plaintiff's Amended Motion for Weekly Order of Payments per [General Statutes] § 52-356d without properly and completely considering Judgment-Debtor's financial circumstances as required by said statute?

"2. Did the Trial Court err in granting Plaintiff's Amended Motion for Weekly Order of Payments per [General Statutes] § 52-356d in the amount of \$500.00 per week when the evidence presented at the May 23, 2000 hearing did not support that finding?

"3. Did the Trial Court err in finding, as found in its Ruling on Plaintiff's Motion for Order of Payments dated August 2, 2000, that 'it is reasonable to conclude that the defendant's 'financial circumstances' will substantially exceed [an] annual salary of \$52,000.00 in the year 2000' when no such direct evidence of same was presented to the Trial Court?

"4. Did the Trial Court err in denying Defendant's Motion to Reargue?"