

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

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 advance release version of an opinion and the latest version appearing in the Connecticut Law Journal and subsequently in the Connecticut Reports or Connecticut Appellate Reports, the latest version is to be considered authoritative.

The syllabus and procedural history accompanying the opinion as it appears 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.

\*\*\*\*\*

M. M. v. H. F.\*  
(AC 42136)

Elgo, Devlin and Harper, Js.

Argued October 17—officially released November 19, 2019

*Procedural History*

Action for the dissolution of a marriage, and for other relief, brought to the Superior Court in the judicial district of Waterbury, and tried to the court, *Hon. Lloyd Cutsumpas*, judge trial referee; judgment dissolving the marriage and granting certain other relief; thereafter, the court, *Ficeto, J.*, denied the defendant's request for leave to file a motion for modification, and the defendant appealed to this court. *Affirmed.*

*H. F.*, self-represented, the appellant (defendant).

*M. M.*, self-represented, the appellee (plaintiff).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. In this postjudgment marital dissolution matter, the defendant, H. F., appeals from the judgment of the trial court denying her request for leave to file a motion to modify custody and visitation of the parties' minor child.<sup>1</sup> The trial court denied the defendant's request for leave to file a motion to modify on the ground that she failed to allege facts sufficient to constitute a substantial change in circumstances, and, further, that her motion simply reiterated allegations that she previously had presented to the court. On the basis of our careful and thorough review of the record, we cannot conclude that the trial court erred in so holding.

The judgment is affirmed.

\* In accordance with our policy of protecting the privacy interests of the victims of family violence, we decline to identify the victim or others through whom the victim's identity may be ascertained. See General Statutes § 54-86e.

<sup>1</sup> Because the defendant had a history of filing motions for contempt and/or modification "without sufficient cause or without alleging a substantial change in circumstance[s]," the trial court issued an order on July 19, 2017, requiring the defendant to seek leave of the court pursuant to Practice Book § 25-26 (g), prior to filing further motions.

---