
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.

ALONZO JACKSON *v.* COMMISSIONER OF
CORRECTION
(AC 26159)

Flynn, C. J., and McLachlan and Pellegrino, Js.

Argued April 27—officially released July 18, 2006

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

Kathryn Steadman, special public defender, for the
appellant (petitioner).

David M. Carlucci, special deputy assistant state's
attorney, with whom were *Michael E. O'Hare*, supervi-
sory assistant state's attorney, and, on the brief, *John A.*
Connelly, state's attorney, and *Terence Mariani*, senior
assistant state's attorney, for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The petitioner, Alonzo Jackson,
appeals following the habeas court's denial of his peti-
tion for certification to appeal from the judgment deny-
ing his amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus.
We dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner was convicted, following a jury trial,
of robbery in the first degree in violation of General
Statutes § 53a-134 (a) (4) and kidnapping in the first
degree in violation of General Statutes § 53a-92 (a) (2)
(B). The petitioner received a total effective sentence
of eighteen years incarceration. He then filed a direct
appeal, and this court affirmed the judgment of convic-
tion. See *State v. Jackson*, 68 Conn. App. 901, 792 A.2d
914 (2002).

The petitioner subsequently filed an amended peti-
tion for a writ of habeas corpus in which he claimed
that his trial counsel and appellate counsel had provided
ineffective assistance. The habeas court rejected the
petitioner's claims and then denied his petition for certi-
fication to appeal. On appeal, the petitioner claims that
the court improperly denied his petition for certification
to appeal because his trial counsel was ineffective in
reacting to the state's filing of a substitute information
on the day that jury selection commenced. The peti-
tioner contends that his trial counsel inadequately
explained the charges in the substitute information and

should have requested a continuance in order to ensure that the petitioner understood them.¹

The petitioner must demonstrate that the court abused its discretion in denying his petition for certification to appeal. Our review of the record and briefs reveals that the state filed the substitute information on May 2, 2000. Jury selection proceeded from that date until May 4, 2000, but the taking of evidence did not begin until May 24, 2000. The petitioner therefore had twenty-two days to consider the charges and discuss them with his trial counsel before the taking of evidence began. We conclude that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the issues he has 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 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). Accordingly, the court did not abuse its discretion in denying the petition for certification to appeal.

The appeal is dismissed.

¹ The petitioner does not claim that the court improperly denied his petition for certification to appeal on the basis of the court's finding that his appellate counsel had provided effective assistance.