

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

MARK HEINONEN *v.* JAMES M.  
MANDRACCHIA ET AL.  
(AC 30858)

Flynn, C. J., and Gruendel and West, Js.\*

Argued February 17—officially released May 4, 2010

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of  
Danbury, Sheedy, J.)

*Mark Heinonen*, pro se, the appellant (plaintiff).

*J. Kevin Golger*, for the appellees (defendants).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. In this negligence action, the plaintiff, Mark Heinonen, appeals from the judgment, rendered after a jury trial, in favor of the defendants, James M. Mandracchia and Cheryl Mandracchia. After a thorough review of the record, transcripts, briefs and oral argument, and affording those claims that properly are before this court careful consideration, we conclude that the plaintiff's claims are without merit.

The judgment is affirmed.

\* The listing of judges reflects their seniority status on this court as of the date of oral argument.

---