
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.

DAVE ANTHONY HALL *v.* COMMISSIONER
OF CORRECTION
(AC 30213)

Flynn, C. J., and Harper and Dupont, Js.

Argued October 21—officially released November 17, 2009

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

Deren Manasevit, special public defender, for the
appellant (petitioner).

Richard K. Greenalch, Jr., special deputy assistant
state's attorney, with whom, on the brief, were *Matthew
C. Gedansky*, state's attorney, and *Brenda Hans*, deputy
assistant state's attorney, for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The petitioner, Dave Anthony Hall, appeals following the habeas court's denial of his petition for certification to appeal from that court's judgment denying his amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus. On appeal, the petitioner 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.

Following our review of the record and briefs, and after considering the oral arguments of the parties, we conclude that the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the court abused its discretion in denying his petition because he 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 are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further. See *Lozada v. Deeds*, 498 U.S. 430, 431–32, 111 S. Ct. 860, 112 L. Ed. 2d 956 (1991); *Simms v. Warden*, 230 Conn. 608, 616, 646 A.2d 126 (1994).

The appeal is dismissed.
