
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.

CHARLES D. GIANETTI *v.* DAVID E.
GOMBOS ET AL.
(AC 34099)

Lavine, Bear and Pellegrino, Js.

Argued January 15—officially released April 23, 2013

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Fairfield, Hon. Edward F. Stodolink, judge trial referee.)

Charles D. Gianetti, pro se, the appellant (plaintiff).

David E. Gombos, pro se, and *Catherine W. Gombos*,
pro se, the appellees (defendants).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. After reviewing the record and considering the issue presented by the self-represented plaintiff, Charles D. Gianetti, a physician, in this appeal from the judgment of the trial court rendered in favor of the self-represented defendants, David E. Gombos and Catherine W. Gombos, we are not persuaded that the court committed reversible error.¹

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ The plaintiff has presented us with a limited record; see, e.g., Practice Book § 61-10; *Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Bertrand*, 140 Conn. App. 646, 654, 59 A.3d 864 (2013); and a brief that fails to identify, discuss or analyze any Connecticut statutes or case law relating to the type, meaning and effect of assignments, including but not limited to the relevant statutes or case law existing at the time of the specific assignment prepared by the plaintiff and executed by the defendants in this case. See, e.g., *Carrillo v. Goldberg*, 141 Conn. App. 299, 307 n.7, 59 A.3d 902 (2013); *In re Jason M.*, 140 Conn. App. 708, 711 n.2, 59 A.3d 902 (2013).