
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.

KEVIN LUCAS v. COMMISSIONER OF CORRECTION
(AC 23887)

Schaller, Dranginis and Gruendel, Js.

Submitted on briefs October 13—officially released November 15, 2005

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of New Haven, Radcliffe, J.)

Kevin Lucas, pro se, the appellant (petitioner), filed a brief.

John A. Connelly, state's attorney, *Mitchell S. Brody*, senior assistant state's attorney, and *Eva B. Lenczewski*, supervisory assistant state's attorney, filed a brief for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The petitioner, Kevin Lucas,¹ appeals after the habeas court denied his petition for certification to appeal from the dismissal of his revised amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus in which he alleged ineffective assistance of trial counsel. We dismiss the appeal.

We carefully have reviewed the record and the briefs and conclude that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the issues he raises 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).

The appeal is dismissed.

¹ The petitioner previously was convicted of conspiracy to possess a narcotic substance with intent to sell in violation of General Statutes §§ 53a-48 and 21a-277 (a), possession of a narcotic substance with intent to sell in violation of General Statutes § 21a-277 (a) and possession of a narcotic substance with intent to sell within 1500 feet of a school in violation of General Statutes § 21a-278a (b). This court affirmed the judgment of conviction in *State v. Lucas*, 63 Conn. App. 263, 775 A.2d 338, cert. denied, 256 Conn. 930, 776 A.2d 1148 (2001).