

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

FLYNN, J., dissenting. I respectfully dissent and would reverse the conviction and order a new trial because I believe that a person accused of a crime is entitled under our state and federal constitutions to the date or approximate dates within which the accused is said to have committed a crime if that information is known to the child victim and thus available to the state. U.S. Const., amend. VI, amend. XIV; Conn. Const., art. I, § 8. While we recognized in *State v. Saraceno*, 15 Conn. App. 222, 237, 545 A.2d 1116, cert. denied, 209 Conn. 823, 824, 552 A.2d 431, 432 (1988), that child victims may have difficulty recalling dates of sexual assaults, we did not relieve the prosecution of the duty of asking such a victim what she recalls. It is clear from this victim's testimony that she was never asked to pinpoint the dates of her assaults until her cross-examination and when asked was able to pinpoint the month and year in which she said they began. The prejudice to this defendant was obvious. He was required to defend against an unparticularized information, which would permit a conviction for occurrences within a six year time period, when a narrower timeframe than that provided in the information was available. See *State v. Blasius*, 211 Conn. 455, 461, 559 A.2d 1116 (1989); *State v. Stepney*, 191 Conn. 233, 242, 464 A.2d 758 (1983), cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1084, 104 S. Ct. 1455, 79 L. Ed. 2d 772 (1984).

If the state did not possess the information, as it claims, it is because it never asked the child victim for it. It is one thing to hold, as did our Supreme Court in *State v. Stepney*, supra, 191 Conn. 241–42, that a seven hour timeframe as to when the murder victim died was reasonable where a more limited and precise timeframe could not be determined by the state.<sup>1</sup> It is quite another to burden a defendant with defending against a six year time period, as has happened here, when a more particular and limited timeframe could have been alleged. If a six year timeframe is not a burden of “sufficient magnitude” prejudicing the defendant’s ability to present a defense, it is unlikely that there will ever be one.

<sup>1</sup> The *Stepney* court held that even if the state could have narrowed the seven hour timeframe during which the *Stephney* victim’s murder occurred, the burden of defending against an information alleging that the murder occurred within a seven hour timeframe was not of “sufficient magnitude to prejudice his ability to present an adequate defense.” *State v. Stepney*, supra, 191 Conn. 242.