

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

WEST HAVEN LUMBER v. SENTRY CONSTRUCTION CORP.—  
CONCURRENCE

LAVINE, J., concurring. In the usual circumstance, counsel's failure to find the time—even in the midst of a busy schedule—to attend a court-ordered deposition prior to trial would create significant concerns about the fairness of the proceedings. The order requiring that a deposition be scheduled at “a mutually convenient time” cannot plausibly be read as a request of counsel to schedule a deposition only if a convenient time could be found. The only reasonable reading was to *require* counsel to make herself available for a deposition. Nonetheless, I agree that the court's denial of the motions filed by the defendant, Sentry Construction Corporation, for a continuance and a nonsuit was not an abuse of discretion, given the particular facts of this case. This decision should not, however, be read to countenance self-serving interpretations of court orders.

For the foregoing reasons, I respectfully concur in the majority opinion.

---