
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.

ROBERT CHIULLI, JR. v. CHRIS
CHIULLI ET AL.
(AC 37136)

Lavine, Alvord and Bishop, Js.

Argued October 27—officially released December 8, 2015

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Hartford, Peck, J.)

George W. Kramer, for the appellant (plaintiff).

Eric H. Rothausser, with whom, on the brief, was *Lee
B. Ross*, for the appellees (defendants).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Robert Chiulli, Jr., appeals from the trial court's judgment in favor of the defendants, Chris Chiulli and his business, Double "C" Construction Company, LLC. The plaintiff claims that (1) the facts do not support the trial court's judgment as to his breach of contract claim, and (2) the court erred in its application of the law in regard to his claims of conversion and statutory theft. We disagree.

Our examination of the record on appeal and the arguments of the parties persuade us that the judgment of the trial court should be affirmed. Because the trial court's memorandum of decision fully addresses the arguments raised in the present appeal, we adopt its concise and well reasoned decision as a proper statement of the relevant facts and the applicable law concerning the issues raised by the plaintiff. See *Chiulli v. Chiulli*, 161 Conn. App. 639, 93 A.3d 1203 (2014) (appendix). It would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained therein. See *Discover Bank v. Hill*, 150 Conn. App. 164, 174, 93 A.3d 159, cert. denied, 312 Conn. 924, 94 A.3d 1203 (2014).

The judgment is affirmed.
