
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.

ELIZABETH RICHTER *v.* ALEXANDER G. RICHTER
(AC 33888)

DiPentima, C. J., and Gruendel and Espinosa, Js.

Argued October 11—officially released December 4, 2012

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Hartford, Epstein, J. [judgment]; Abery-Wetstone, J.
[motion for injunctive relief].)

Elizabeth Richter, pro se, the appellant (plaintiff).

Edith F. McClure, for the appellee (defendant).

PER CURIAM. In this dissolution proceeding, the self-represented plaintiff, Elizabeth Richter, appeals from the judgment of the trial court denying her motion for a permanent injunction. That motion requested an order that the court's September 16, 2010 memorandum of decision be removed from the trial court record specifically and the Internet generally. In the September 16, 2010 memorandum of decision, the trial court denied the plaintiff's motions to open the judgment of dissolution and granted the motion of the defendant, Alexander G. Richter, for attorney's fees.¹ This court affirmed the propriety of that judgment on appeal. *Richter v. Richter*, 137 Conn. App. 231, 237, 48 A.3d 686 (2012).

We have reviewed the plaintiff's various claims, including one alleging judicial bias, and conclude that they are equally without merit. Mindful that a prayer for injunctive relief is addressed to the sound discretion of the court; *Broadnax v. New Haven*, 270 Conn. 133, 170, 851 A.2d 1113 (2004); we conclude that the trial court in the present case did not abuse its discretion in denying the plaintiff's motion.

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ In granting the motion for attorney's fees, the court found that "after the plaintiff filed her original motion to open, the file has erupted from one and a half volumes to four volumes and that even while the court heard the case, the file was being peppered with motions and uninvited memoranda. In addition, the court found that the plaintiff had caused substantial legal costs to the defendant by filing false claims and that she had filed the present case in order to get even with a person she believed was her enemy." (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Richter v. Richter*, 137 Conn. App. 231, 233, 48 A.3d 686 (2012).
