
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.

DARRYL HOLLIS v. COMMISSIONER OF
CORRECTION
(AC 23200)

Foti, West and McLachlan, Js.

Submitted on briefs November 21—officially released December 23, 2003

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of New Haven, Booth, J.)

Francis L. O'Reilly, special public defender, filed a brief for the appellant (petitioner).

Michael Dearington, state's attorney, *Christopher T. Godialis*, assistant state's attorney, and *Paul J. Ferencek*, senior assistant state's attorney, filed a brief for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The petitioner, Darryl Hollis, appeals from the judgment of the habeas court dismissing his amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus. On appeal, he claims that the court abused its discretion in denying his petition for certification to appeal from the dismissal of his petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The petitioner's statement of issues and his brief are limited to that single claim.¹ The record is clear, however, that the court granted his petition for certification to appeal. Although the petitioner's sole claim is unfounded in the record, we will review the entire record and the briefs to determine whether the judgment of the court should be reversed on its merits. See *Mason v. Commissioner of Correction*, 80 Conn. App. 142, 145, 832 A.2d 1216 (2003).

"For the petitioner to prevail on his [underlying] claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, he must establish both that his counsel's performance was deficient and that there is a reasonable probability that, but for the counsel's mistakes, the result of the proceeding would have been different." *White v. Commissioner of Correction*, 58 Conn. App. 169, 170, 752 A.2d 1159 (2000), citing *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 694, 104 S. Ct. 2052, 80 L. Ed. 2d 674 (1984). After reviewing the record and briefs, we conclude that the petitioner has failed to sustain his burden.

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ Although the petitioner briefed only that issue, his brief does address, to some extent, the merits of his underlying claim of ineffective assistance of counsel.
