

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

GEORGE FRANK v. COMMISSIONER OF  
CORRECTION  
(AC 25295)

Lavery, C. J., and DiPentima and Harper, Js.

Submitted on briefs May 27—officially released July 19, 2005

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of  
Tolland, geographical area number nineteen, Fuger, J.)

*Kevin E. Dehghani*, special public defender, filed a  
brief for the appellant (petitioner).

*James E. Thomas*, state's attorney, *Eileen F. McCarthy*,  
assistant state's attorney, and *Vicki Melchiorre*,  
senior assistant state's attorney, filed a brief for the  
appellee (respondent).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The habeas court denied the amended  
petition for a writ of habeas corpus that was filed by  
the petitioner, George Frank. The petitioner claimed  
that his trial counsel rendered ineffective legal assis-  
tance. The petitioner appeals following the court's  
denial of his petition for certification to appeal. We  
dismiss the appeal.

We have reviewed the issues raised by the petitioner  
in his amended petition as well as the court's thorough  
resolution of those issues. We conclude that the peti-  
tioner has not demonstrated that the issues raised 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 fur-  
ther. See *Lozada v. Deeds*, 498 U.S. 430, 431–32, 111 S.  
Ct. 860, 112 L. Ed. 2d 956 (1991). Having failed to satisfy  
any of those criteria, the petitioner has failed to demon-  
strate that the court's denial of his petition for certifica-  
tion to appeal reflects an abuse of discretion. See  
*Simms v. Warden*, 230 Conn. 608, 616, 646 A.2d 126  
(1994).

The appeal is dismissed.

---