

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

LAVINE, J., concurring. I agree that the trial court's judgment should be affirmed. I write separately because I do not agree that any prosecutorial improprieties occurred in closing argument.<sup>1</sup>

The majority concludes that the prosecutor improperly referred to facts that were not in evidence when he argued to the jury that it could infer intent to kill because it takes more effort to fire a revolver as opposed to a semiautomatic weapon. In light of the expert testimony concerning the differences between a revolver and a semiautomatic weapon, referenced in the majority's opinion, I see nothing at all wrong with this argument. The prosecutor simply was asking the jury to draw a reasonable, common sense inference from the evidence. The jury was free to draw the requested inference, or not, as it saw fit. See *State v. Palangio*, 115 Conn. App. 355, 366, A.2d (2009) (“[t]he jury members may draw from the evidence only such inferences as are reasonable, but they are not required to put aside their common sense”).

I also disagree with the majority's conclusion that the state's repetitive use of the phrase, “doesn't it offend your common sense,” was improper. This garden variety argument employs a common rhetorical device. It is the *repeated* use of the phrase that leads the majority to conclude that the prosecutor improperly expressed a personal opinion. If, however, using the phrase once is not improper—and the majority cites no case standing for that proposition—how can the repeated use of the phrase be considered improper? To reach the conclusion it reaches, the majority must condemn even the single use of the phrase, “doesn't it offend your common sense.” This the majority opinion does not do.

Because I conclude that the prosecutor's closing argument was not improper, I respectfully concur.

---

<sup>1</sup> I agree with the facts as stated by the majority.