

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

KATHRYN LUCAS *v.* GENERAL ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA  
(AC 19091)

Mihalakos, Zarella and O’Connell, Js.

Argued March 20—officially released August 29, 2000

Counsel

*Albert E. Sheary*, with whom was *Elizabeth A. Zembko*, for the appellant (plaintiff).

*Michael M. Wilson*, with whom, on the brief, was *Anthony P. Fusco*, for the appellee (defendant).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. This is an appeal brought by the plaintiff, Kathryn Lucas, from the judgment of the trial court confirming an arbitration award. The sole issue on appeal is whether the plaintiff was a resident in the home of the defendant’s insured at the time of her motor vehicle accident. Two of the three arbitrators concluded that the plaintiff’s mere physical presence in her father’s home did not establish residency and, therefore, she was not covered under the underinsured motorist provisions of her father’s policy.

Our examination of the record and briefs persuades us that the judgment of the trial court confirming the arbitration award should be affirmed. The issue presented was resolved properly by the court's thoughtful and comprehensive memorandum of decision. See *Lucas v. General Accident Ins. Co. of America*, 46 Conn. Sup. 502, 746 A.2d 751 (1998). Because that memorandum of 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 therein. See *East v. Labbe*, 54 Conn. App. 479, 480, 735 A.2d 370 (1999), *aff'd*, 252 Conn. 359, 746 A.2d 751 (2000).

The judgment is affirmed.

---