
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.

BETWEEN ROUNDS FRANCHISE
CORPORATION ET AL. *v.* EDGR
REAL ESTATE, LLC
(AC 33461)

Alvord, Bear and Espinosa, Js.

Submitted on briefs February 3—officially released April 17, 2012

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of New
Britain, Hon. Lois Tanzer, judge trial referee.)

William C. Charamut filed a brief for the appel-
lant (defendant).

David A. Haught filed a brief for the appellees
(plaintiffs).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The defendant, EDGR Real Estate, LLC, appeals from the judgment of the trial court denying its motion to vacate an arbitration award and granting the application of the plaintiffs, Between Rounds Franchise Corporation and Between Rounds Rocky Hill, LLC, to confirm that award. On appeal, the defendant claims that the court improperly denied its motion to vacate and granted the plaintiffs' application to confirm because the arbitration panel (panel) was guilty of misconduct under General Statutes § 52-418 (a) (3), the defendant was denied a full and fair hearing, and the defendant was substantially prejudiced by the denial of its request to postpone the hearing before the panel. We affirm the judgment of the court.

The plaintiffs and the defendant became involved in a landlord-tenant dispute. The plaintiffs applied to the court to compel arbitration pursuant to a clause in the parties' lease. On January 25, 2010, the court issued an order compelling arbitration, and the matter was scheduled to be heard before the panel on November 9, 2010. The defendant's counsel withdrew his appearance on November 1, 2010, with permission of the court. The defendant requested postponement of the hearing until it could obtain new counsel and the required funds to pay its share of the cost of the panel. Thus, the panel postponed the hearing until December 1, 2010. One day before the rescheduled hearing, the defendant requested another postponement of the proceedings. The plaintiffs objected, and the panel agreed to hear arguments regarding the postponement the following day. The defendant failed to appear before the panel. The hearing therefore proceeded as rescheduled and, on December 16, 2010, the panel issued its decision in favor of the plaintiffs.

After examining the record and the briefs, we are persuaded that the judgment should be affirmed. The issues raised by the defendant were resolved properly in the thoughtful and concise decision of the court. *Between Rounds Franchise Corp. v. EDGR Real Estate, LLC*, 52 Conn. Sup. , A.3d (2011). Because that decision also fully addresses the arguments raised in the present appeal, we adopt the court's well reasoned decision as a statement of the facts and the applicable law on those issues. It would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat that discussion here. See *Tzovolos v. Wiseman*, 300 Conn. 247, 253–54, 12 A.3d 563 (2011).

The judgment is affirmed.
