

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

JOHN M. WOLOD ET AL. v. RAYMOND P.  
BOLASH ET AL.  
(AC 22725)

Lavery, C. J., and Schaller and West, Js.

Argued February 13—officially released July 15, 2003

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of  
Ansonia-Milford, Hon. Hugh C. Curran, judge trial  
referee.)

*John M. Wolod*, pro se, the appellant (named  
plaintiff).

*James C. Whitney*, for the appellees (defendants).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The defendants, Raymond P. Bolash, Margaret Bolash and Robert Bolash, appeal from the judgment of the trial court denying them any award of damages for the physical damage and emotional distress they asserted were inflicted on them by the plaintiffs, John M. Wolod and Michael J. Wolod, pursuant to counts four and five of the defendants' counterclaim. They claim that the court improperly determined that (1) proof of specific financial expense is an element of a cause of action for intentional infliction of emotional distress and (2) proof of specific economic loss is a necessary element of a claim of trespass. We are not persuaded.

The defendants' arguments are premised on their assertion that the court found that they had proven the elements of the causes of action brought against the plaintiffs and, therefore, that they were entitled to damages. Contrary to that assertion, a review of the record, including the court's memorandum of decision, reveals that the court merely found that "the plaintiff John Wolod may have committed acts of vandalism" and that the defendant Robert Bolash "may have been harassed by the [plaintiff] John Wolod." The court did not find that the defendants had proven the elements of their causes of action by the appropriate standard of proof. The court then indicated, essentially, that in any event, no proof of damages had been established with respect

to either legal claim and no damages would be awarded.  
Because neither cause of action was proven by the  
defendants, the court properly denied recovery.

The judgment is affirmed.

---