
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.

SCOTT JOHNSON v. VICTORIA DE TOLEDO ET AL.
(SC 16475)

Sullivan, C. J., and Norcott, Katz, Palmer and Zarella, Js.

Argued October 24—officially released December 18, 2001

Counsel

Anthony M. Modugno, with whom, on the brief, was *Frank Modugno*, for the appellant (plaintiff).

John M. Gasidlo, for the appellees (named defendant et al.).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Scott Johnson doing business as Viking Painting, appeals, following our grant of certification, from the judgment of the Appellate Court, which affirmed the trial court’s judgment granting the application of the defendant homeowners, Victoria de Toledo and Stewart M. Casper, to discharge the mechanic’s lien filed by the plaintiff against their property. *Johnson v. de Toledo*, 61 Conn. App. 156, 763 A.2d 28 (2000). We granted the plaintiff’s petition for certification to appeal limited to the following issue: “Did the Appellate Court properly conclude that the trial court had used the proper standard of proof in discharging

the plaintiff's mechanic's lien?" *Johnson v. de Toledo*, 255 Conn. 938, 767 A.2d 1212 (2001).

After examining the entire record on appeal and considering the briefs and oral arguments of the parties, we have determined that the appeal in this case should be dismissed on the ground that certification was improvidently granted.

The appeal is dismissed.
