
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.

BERDON, J., dissenting. On the basis of the majority's recitation of the fact that the defendant, Corey Mapp, pleaded guilty to illegal possession of a weapon in a motor vehicle in violation of General Statutes § 29-38, for which he received a two year sentence of imprisonment, I would have joined the majority in affirming the judgment of the trial court.

It has been called to our attention, however, by a report of the staff attorney that a habeas action is pending on the defendant's behalf. Because that habeas action, among other matters, challenges the validity of the defendant's guilty plea with respect to the possession of the weapon, I address the issue with reservation.

Moreover, in this appeal, neither defense counsel nor the state's attorney discussed this pending habeas appeal in their briefs or at their oral argument. Under these circumstances, I would order the parties to file supplemental briefs with respect to the effect of the pending habeas action.

Accordingly, I must respectfully dissent.
