
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.

LANDAU, J., concurring. I concur in the majority's result affirming the judgment of the trial court. I, however, respectfully disagree that this court needs to distinguish actual malice and general malice in a case of this nature. I also disagree with the majority's assertion that the plaintiff could have prevailed on the motion for summary judgment if he had demonstrated a factual predicate that the defendants acted with malice. I do not believe that General Statutes §§ 19a-17b and 19a-20 abrogate the public policy grounds underlying the common-law rule providing absolute immunity to parties to and witnesses before judicial and quasi-judicial proceedings. See *Petyan v. Ellis*, 200 Conn. 243, 247–48, 510 A.2d 1337 (1986) (information supplied by employer on fact-finding supplement form of employment security division of state labor department entitled to absolute immunity); *Preston v. O'Rourke*, 74 Conn. App. 301, 309–15, 811 A.2d 753 (2002) (arbitration is quasi-judicial proceeding and testimony entitled to absolute immunity); *Field v. Kearns*, 43 Conn. App. 265, 270–77, 682 A.2d 148 (“bar grievants are absolutely immune from liability for the content of any relevant statements made during a bar grievance proceeding”), cert. denied, 239 Conn. 942, 684 A.2d 711 (1996).

For these reasons, I respectfully concur.
