

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

COVENANT HOME, INC. v. TOWN OF CROMWELL  
(AC 20599)

Schaller, Mihalakos and Stoughton, Js.

Argued February 27—officially released May 8, 2001

Counsel

*Kenneth R. Slater, Jr.*, with whom, on the brief, was *Edward T. Lynch, Jr.*, for the appellant (plaintiff).

*John W. Bradley, Jr.*, for the appellee (defendant).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Covenant Home, Inc., appeals from the judgment of the trial court denying a petition and motion for contempt by which it sought to have the defendant, the town of Cromwell, adjudged in contempt for its disregard of a prior judgment. We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

In 1988, the parties stipulated to a judgment in connection with a settlement of tax appeals. A judgment was rendered in accordance with the stipulation on December 28, 1988. As part of the judgment, and in accordance with the stipulation, the court found that the infirmary located on the plaintiff's property was

exempt from taxation. In February, 1999, the assessor for the defendant determined that the infirmity no longer was exempt from taxation, and the plaintiff appealed to the board of assessment appeals, which denied the appeal. The plaintiff then filed its petition and motion for contempt, which the court denied. This appeal followed.

The plaintiff claims that the court improperly (1) found that the remedy of contempt is not available to enforce the judgment against the defendant and (2) denied the plaintiff an evidentiary hearing. We disagree.

Our examination of the record and briefs has persuaded us that the judgment of the court should be affirmed. The issues presented at trial were resolved properly in the court's thoughtful and comprehensive memorandum of decision. See *Covenant Home, Inc. v. Cromwell*, 47 Conn. Sup. 60, A.2d (2000). Because the decision fully addresses the arguments raised in this appeal, we adopt it as a proper statement of the facts and the applicable law on those issues. It would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained in the court's decision. See *East v. Labbe*, 54 Conn. App. 479, 480–81, 735 A.2d 370 (1999), *aff'd*, 252 Conn. 359, 746 A.2d 751 (2000).

The judgment is affirmed.

---