
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.

ROBERT PAWLOWSKI, ADMINISTRATOR (ESTATE
OF STEVEN PAWLOWSKI), ET AL. *v.* DELTA
SIGMA PHI FRATERNITY, INC. ET AL.
(AC 32862)

Lavine, Alvord and Bear, Js.

Argued November 29, 2011—officially released January 3, 2012

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of New
Haven, B. Fischer, J.)

Richard L. Newman, for the appellants (plaintiffs).

Patricia M. Shepard, with whom, on the brief, was
Lawrence H. Adler, for the appellee (defendant
Conor Melville).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiffs, Robert Pawlowski and Joan Pawlowski, administrators of the estate of Steven Pawlowski, appeal from the summary judgment rendered by the trial court in favor of the defendant Conor Melville.¹ On appeal, the plaintiffs claim that the court improperly found that there was no genuine issue of material fact regarding Melville's alleged negligence. The plaintiffs claim that there was sufficient circumstantial evidence to bring the case before a jury on the issue of whether Melville was a social host who purveyed alcohol to the plaintiffs' decedent. We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

Whether Melville owed a duty to the plaintiffs' decedent was a question of law properly decided on summary judgment. *Vitale v. Kowal*, 101 Conn. App. 691, 698–99, 923 A.2d 778, cert. denied, 284 Conn. 904, 931 A.2d 268 (2007). In ruling on the motion for summary judgment, the court issued a memorandum of decision, which is a concise and thoughtful statement of the facts and the applicable law on the issue. See *Pawlowski v. Delta Sigma Phi Fraternity, Inc.*, 52 Conn. Sup. 186, A.3d (2010). We therefore adopt the decision of the trial court as our own. It would serve no useful purpose for this court to repeat the discussion contained therein. See *Norfolk & Dedham Mutual Fire Ins. Co. v. Wysocki*, 243 Conn. 239, 241, 702 A.2d 638 (1997).

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ The original complaint named eleven defendants. Melville is the only defendant relevant to this appeal.
