
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.

MCDONALD, J., concurring. I concur in the result of the majority opinion.

There was no genuine issue before the trial court that on March 15, 2000, the defendant attorney, Osvaldo Gonzalez, negotiated a plea bargain on behalf of the plaintiff, William Pagan, that provided that the plaintiff could not argue for a lesser sentence in the underlying criminal matter. At that time, Gonzalez, who was acting *pro hac vice*, was accompanied by the plaintiff's Connecticut attorney. At sentencing on July 12, 2000, Gonzalez was present without the Connecticut attorney, and the court sentenced the plaintiff exactly in accordance with the plea bargain.

I would conclude that the plaintiff was required to establish through expert testimony how he suffered any damage from the failure of Connecticut counsel to be present at sentencing, that is, evidence of proximate causation.
