
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.

DION M. HENRY v. COMMISSIONER OF
CORRECTION
(AC 25091)

Dranginis, Flynn and DiPentima, Js.

Submitted on briefs December 2, 2004—officially released January 25, 2005

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Tolland, White, J.)

Robert J. McKay filed a brief for the appellant (petitioner).

Michael Dearington, state's attorney, *Christine Collyer*, special deputy assistant state's attorney, and *Linda N. Howe*, senior assistant state's attorney, filed a brief for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The habeas court dismissed the petition for a writ of habeas corpus that was filed by the petitioner, Dion M. Henry, and then denied his petition for certification to appeal from that dismissal. After careful review of the record and briefs, we conclude that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the issues are debatable among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner or that the questions raised deserve encouragement to proceed further. See *Lozada v. Deeds*, 498 U.S. 430, 431–32, 111 S. Ct. 860, 112 L. Ed. 2d 956 (1991); *Simms v. Warden*, 230 Conn. 608, 616, 646 A.2d 126 (1994).

The appeal is dismissed.
