
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.

DUANE ZIEMBA v. COMMISSIONER OF
CORRECTION
(AC 24402)

Flynn, Gruendel and Harper, Js.

Submitted on briefs April 29—officially released July 5, 2005

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

Richard C. Marquette, special public defender, filed
a brief for the appellant (petitioner).

Timothy J. Liston, state's attorney, *Elizabeth M.
Moseley*, special deputy assistant state's attorney, and
Jo Anne Sulik, assistant state's attorney, filed a brief
for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The petitioner, Duane Ziemba, fails to
set forth in his brief any analysis of his claim that the
court abused its discretion by denying his petition for
certification to appeal from the denial of his petition
for a writ of habeas corpus.

“We are not required to review issues that have been
improperly presented to this court through an inade-
quate brief. . . . Analysis, rather than mere abstract
assertion, is required in order to avoid abandoning an
issue by failure to brief the issue properly. . . . The
petitioner has provided us with nothing more than con-
clusory assertions.” (Citations omitted; internal quota-
tion marks omitted.) *Blakeney v. Commissioner of
Correction*, 47 Conn. App. 568, 586, 706 A.2d 989, cert.
denied, 244 Conn. 913, 713 A.2d 830 (1998).

The appeal is dismissed.
