

\*\*\*\*\*

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 concur with the majority's result. I write separately, however, because I believe that the defendant's second claim is not reviewable, and we need proceed no further.

The defendant has a history of prior felony convictions. He therefore filed a motion asking the trial court to preclude the state during cross-examination from impeaching his credibility by offering evidence of his five felony convictions. The court denied the motion but limited the extent to which the state could use the prior convictions. The court would permit the state to name only two of the convictions, and the remainder would be referred to as unnamed felony convictions. The defendant asserts that, on the basis of the court's ruling, he elected not to testify on his own behalf. On appeal, he claims that the court deprived him of his constitutional right to testify.

"It is the defendant's burden to provide a record adequate to review any claim he seeks to raise on appeal. Practice Book § 61-10. When a defendant claims that a ruling of the trial court improperly restricted his freedom to choose whether to testify, a reviewing court can meaningfully gauge the validity of the claim only if the record shows what the substance of his testimony would have been." *State v. Hoffer*, 55 Conn. App. 210, 213, 738 A.2d 1145, cert. denied, 251 Conn. 923, 742 A.2d 360 (1999). "[A] defendant must testify to preserve for review any claims of improper impeachment by a prior conviction. *State v. Harrell*, 199 Conn. 255, 265–66, 506 A.2d 1041 (1986)." *State v. Hoffer*, *supra*, 213.

Here, the defendant did not testify. His claim on appeal therefore cannot be reached because there is no record.

For this reason, I respectfully concur in the majority's opinion.