
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.

AUNRAY STANFORD *v.* COMMISSIONER
OF CORRECTION
(AC 29777)

DiPentima, Beach and Stoughton, Js.

Argued November 18, 2009—officially released January 5, 2010

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Tolland, Swords, J.)

Michael Zariphes, special public defender, for the
appellant (petitioner).

James M. Ralls, senior assistant state's attorney, with
whom, on the brief, were *David I. Cohen*, state's attorney,
and *Courtney Gates-Graceson*, assistant state's
attorney, for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The petitioner, Aunray Stanford, pleaded guilty under the well known *Alford* doctrine¹ to charges of attempt to commit murder in violation of General Statutes §§ 53a-49 (a) and 53a-54a (a), assault in the first degree in violation of General Statutes § 53a-59 (a) (1) and robbery in the first degree in violation of General Statutes § 53a-134 (a) (2). He appeals following the denial by the habeas court of his petition for certification to appeal from its judgment denying his second amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus. He claims that the court (1) abused its discretion in denying his petition for certification to appeal and (2) improperly failed to conclude that his trial counsel had rendered ineffective assistance in several respects.

We have carefully reviewed the record and briefs, and, after considering the oral arguments of counsel, we conclude that the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the court abused its discretion in denying his petition for certification to appeal. The petitioner has not shown that the issues involved in his appeal are debatable among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve them in a different manner or that the questions raised deserve encouragement to proceed further. See *Simms v. Warden*, 230 Conn. 608, 616, 646 A.2d 126 (1994).

The appeal is dismissed.

¹ “Under *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25, 91 S. Ct. 160, 27 L. Ed. 2d 162 (1970), a criminal defendant is not required to admit his guilt . . . but consents to being punished as if he were guilty to avoid the risk of proceeding to trial. . . . A guilty plea under the *Alford* doctrine is a judicial oxymoron in that the defendant does not admit guilt but acknowledges that the state’s evidence against him is so strong that he is prepared to accept the entry of a guilty plea nevertheless.” (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *State v. Tabone*, 292 Conn. 417, 421 n.7, 973 A.2d 74 (2009).