
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.

FRANK A. PERRELLI v. ALAN WITKIN
(AC 20971)

Foti, Dranginis and Daly, Js.

Submitted on briefs January 12—officially released February 13, 2001

Counsel

Frank A. Perrelli, pro se, the appellant (plaintiff), filed a brief.

Thomas M. McKeon, filed a brief for the appellee (defendant).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Frank A. Perrelli, appeals from the judgment of the trial court dismissing his action for damages for his failure to post a bond in recognizance in the amount of \$250 within thirty days of the order of the court.

The order to post the bond was entered on August 10, 1999. The plaintiff posted the required bond on August 18, 1999, within the thirty day period allowed by the court. Thereafter, the defendant moved to dismiss the action, claiming that the bond had not been posted. The court granted the defendant’s motion on

October 18, 1999.¹ The record discloses that the plaintiff complied with the court's order and that an inadvertent ministerial error led to the dismissal of the action. We, therefore, reverse the judgment of the trial court dismissing the action and order that the matter be restored to the docket.

The judgment is reversed and the case is remanded with direction to restore the case to the docket.

¹ See Practice Book § 8-6.