

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

DOROTHY KUBALA *v.* HARTFORD ROMAN  
CATHOLIC DIOCESAN CORPORATION  
ET AL.  
(AC 33509)

Alvord, Sheldon and West, Js.

*Argued February 8—officially released March 27, 2012*

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

*John A. Cirello*, for the appellant (plaintiff).

*Beverly S. Knapp*, with whom was *James A. Alissi*,  
for the appellees (defendants).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Dorothy Kubala, appeals from the judgment of the trial court dismissing her action against the defendants, Hartford Roman Catholic Diocesan Corporation, St. Augustine's Church and Robert Rousseau, on the ground that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over the plaintiff's action because the allegations against the defendants involved an impermissible interference with the defendants' right to the free exercise of religion prescribed by the state and federal constitutions and General Statutes § 52-571b. We have examined the record on appeal and considered the briefs and the arguments of the parties and conclude that the judgment of the trial court should be affirmed. Because the trial court thoroughly addressed the arguments raised in this appeal, we adopt its well reasoned decision as a statement of the facts and the applicable law on the issue. See *Kubala v. Hartford Roman Catholic Diocesan Corp.*, 52 Conn. Sup. 218, A.3d (2011). Any further discussion by this court would serve no useful purpose. See, e.g., *Woodruff v. Hemingway*, 297 Conn. 317, 321, 2 A.3d 857 (2010).

The judgment is affirmed.

---