
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.

Y'ISIAH LOPES *v.* SHAWN FARMER ET AL.
(AC 30630)

Lavine, Beach and Hennessy, Js.

Submitted on briefs October 19—officially released December 8, 2009

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Fairfield, Hiller, J.)

John R. Williams filed a brief for the appellant
(plaintiff).

Carmine Perri and *Kevin C. Kelly* filed a brief for
the appellees (named defendant et al.).

PER CURIAM. In this malicious prosecution action, the plaintiff, Y'Isiah Lopes, appeals from the judgment of the trial court rendered in favor of the defendants, Shawn Farmer and Melissa Lucas, Stratford police officers.¹ On appeal, the plaintiff claims that the court improperly granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment because the defendants, who had received complaints that the plaintiff was stalking a student from the high school where he was a substitute teacher, purportedly withheld exculpatory information when applying for an arrest warrant for the plaintiff.² We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

"Practice Book § 17-49 provides that summary judgment shall be rendered forthwith if the pleadings, affidavits and any other proof submitted show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." *LaPenta v. Bank One, N.A.*, 101 Conn. App. 730, 736, 924 A.2d 868, cert. denied, 284 Conn. 905, 931 A.2d 264 (2007). Our review of the court's decision to grant the defendants' motion for summary judgment is plenary. See *Curley v. Kaiser*, 112 Conn. App. 213, 220, 962 A.2d 167 (2009).

After having examined the record and the briefs and having considered the arguments of the parties, we are persuaded that the summary judgment rendered in favor of the defendants should be affirmed. See *Hotshoe Enterprises, LLC v. Hartford*, 284 Conn. 833, 837, 937 A.2d 689 (2008). The court's thoughtful, well-reasoned decision fully addresses the claim raised on appeal, and we therefore adopt it as a statement of the facts and the applicable law. See *Lopes v. Farmer*, 51 Conn. Sup.

, A.2d (2008). No useful purpose would be served by repeating the discussion contained therein. *Sansone v. Nationwide Mutual Fire Ins. Co.*, 62 Conn. App. 526, 528, 771 A.2d 243 (2001).

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ A default for failure to appear was entered against the defendant Kristy Tryjada. Tryjada is not a party to this appeal. In this opinion, we therefore refer to Farmer and Lucas as the defendants.

² The plaintiff alleged that the charges against him were dismissed.
