
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.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT *v.* GREGORY R. LINDSEY
(AC 26633)

Gruendel, Rogers and Mihalakos, Js.

Argued September 14—officially released October 24, 2006

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Tolland, Dyer, J.; Epstein, J.)

Steven A. Tomeo, for the appellant (defendant).

Margaret Gaffney Radionovas, senior assistant state's attorney, with whom, on the brief, were *Matthew C. Gedansky*, state's attorney, and *Keith J. Currier*, former deputy assistant state's attorney, for the appellee (state).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The defendant, Gregory R. Lindsey, appeals from the judgment of conviction rendered following his conditional plea of nolo contendere to operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor in violation of General Statutes § 14-227a. The plea followed the trial court's denial of the defendant's motion to suppress, which the defendant argues was improper. Specifically, he challenges the court's conclusion that the arresting police officer possessed a reasonable and articulable suspicion to stop the defendant's motor vehicle in the early morning hours of November 29, 2003.

Our examination of the record and briefs and our consideration of the arguments of the parties persuade us that the judgment should be affirmed. The issues properly were resolved in the court's complete and well reasoned memorandum of decision. See *State v. Lindsey*, 49 Conn. Sup. 636, A.2d (2005). Because that memorandum of decision fully addresses the arguments raised in this appeal, we adopt it as the proper statement of the relevant facts, issues and applicable law. It would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained therein. See *State v. Pepper*, 272 Conn. 10, 14, 860 A.2d 1221 (2004); *Santiago v. State*, 64 Conn. App. 67, 68–69, 779 A.2d 775, cert. denied, 258 Conn. 913, 782 A.2d 1246 (2001).

The judgment is affirmed.
