

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

CHRISTOPHER STANTON *v.* CHRISTINE STANTON  
(AC 34464)

Beach, Bear and Mihalakos, Js.

Argued May 21—officially released August 6, 2013

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of  
Ansonia-Milford, Hon. John C. Flanagan, judge trial  
referee [judgment]; Turner, J. [motion to modify].)

*Sandra M. McDonough*, for the appellant  
(defendant).

*Frank J. Kolb, Jr.*, with whom, on the brief, was  
*Joseph A. DiSilvestro*, for the appellee (plaintiff).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The defendant, Christine Stanton, appeals from an order of the trial court granting her postjudgment motion for modification of the parties' separation agreement. On appeal, the defendant claims that the court erred in reducing the child support obligations of the plaintiff, Christopher Stanton, despite the finding of the court that the plaintiff's income had substantially increased.

After examining the record and the briefs and considering the arguments of the parties, we are not persuaded that the court abused its discretion in modifying the plaintiff's child support obligations.

The judgment is affirmed.

---