
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, C. J., concurring. I agree with the majority that the defendant, Stephen J. Williams, cannot prevail on his claim that he was entitled to a dismissal pursuant to General Statutes § 54-56b. I reach that conclusion, however, on grounds different from those relied on by the majority. The record is clear that the defendant made a plea agreement to accept a nolle on the remaining charges, and he did not object to the nolle “at the time it [was] offered” as is required under Practice Book § 39-30.¹ He demanded neither a dismissal nor an immediate trial. Rather, he accepted the plea agreement on the record and specifically acknowledged that these were the terms of the plea agreement. He, therefore, has waived any right to a dismissal of the charges under § 54-56b.

I write separately because our Supreme Court determined in *Cislo v. Shelton*, 240 Conn. 590, 598, 692 A.2d 1255 (1997), only that a nolle was the equivalent of a dismissal for purposes of triggering provisions of an indemnity statute, General Statutes § 53-39a, requiring that police officers be reimbursed for their attorney’s fees in certain circumstances where criminal charges against them are dismissed or the officers are found not guilty. The case did not involve a defendant’s constitutional right against double jeopardy or his right under § 54-56b to demand a trial or a dismissal, and, therefore, I would not rely on *Cislo* as persuasive precedent for the present case.

Our Supreme Court made it plain in *State v. Herring*, 209 Conn. 52, 57–58, 547 A.2d 6 (1988), that “[e]ven if the statute of limitations as to . . . misdemeanors were to expire and the erasure statute become operative to deprive the state of access to records concerning [those] charges so as to render reinitiation of prosecution difficult or improbable, reinitiation of prosecution is not impossible.” The court went on to explain that “[t]he statute of limitations is an affirmative defense, not a jurisdictional bar to prosecution . . . and the erasure statute does not foreclose the utilization of the personal and independent observation of witnesses to initiate a new prosecution.” (Citation omitted.) *Id.*, 58.

The court reasoned that “the effect of the entry of the nolle was only to terminate this particular prosecution without an acquittal and without placing the defendant in jeopardy, [and, therefore] he remains vulnerable to reinstatement of a prosecution against him.” *Id.*, 57. The court did not hold the issue moot, even where the statute of limitations had run on the underlying misdemeanor charges and the erasure statute had become effective. Accordingly, I do not agree with the majority that a nolle and a dismissal carry “the same

legal and practical effect.”

¹ Practice Book § 39-30 provides: “Where a prosecution is initiated by complaint or information, the defendant may object to the entering of a nolle prosequi *at the time it is offered* by the prosecuting authority and may demand either a trial or a dismissal, except when a nolle prosequi is entered upon a representation to the judicial authority by the prosecuting authority that a material witness has died, disappeared or become disabled or that material evidence has disappeared or has been destroyed and that a further investigation is therefore necessary.” (Emphasis added.)
