
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.

STOUGHTON, J., concurring. While I agree with the result reached by my colleagues, I write separately simply to express my disagreement with the criticism of the defendant's counsel for his transfer of this novel issue from the small claims session of the Superior Court to the regular civil docket pursuant to Practice Book § 24-21. I believe that the defendant, Action Motors Corporation, an apparently innocent seller that had no knowledge of the salvage history of the vehicle at issue, was entitled to have the plaintiff, Laura Ann Krack, prove her case and had a statutory right to transfer the case to a court of record. I do not join in the criticism of the defendant or the defendant's attorney expressed by the trial court and quoted in the majority opinion. If this indeed were a relatively clear-cut case, it would be difficult to justify the fees that we have approved. Accordingly, I respectfully concur in the result.
