****

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.

****

ROGERS, C. J., concurring. I agree with the majority that a claim for loss of consortium, being derivative in nature, is barred by the settlement of the directly injured party's claim. I write separately because I disagree that this issue, which has not been presented squarely by any previous appeal, necessarily has been conclusively resolved by our past decisions. As detailed by the majority and dissenting opinions, our past jurisprudence articulating the rule in question does not include a case with a procedural posture identical to the present one, which places the propriety of the rule directly at issue. See *Hopson* v. *St. Mary's Hospital*, 176 Conn. 485, 494–95, 408 A.2d 260 (1979) (recognizing, as general matter, viability of claim for loss of consortium); see also *Jacoby* v. *Brinkerhoff*, 250 Conn. 86, 93–95, 735 A.2d 347 (1999) (disallowing loss of consortium claim when purportedly injured spouse had refused to pursue any claim herself); *Ladd* v. *Douglas Trucking Co.*, 203 Conn. 187, 195, 523 A.2d 1031 (1987) (rejecting claim for postmortem loss of consortium pursuant to either wrongful death statute or common law). Furthermore, as explained by the dissent, the holdings of *Jacoby* and *Ladd* appear to rest on multiple considerations, and not merely the quoted language from *Hopson*.

In light of the foregoing, I believe that we should decide this appeal solely on the basis of the strong policy reasons enumerated in the majority opinion. Accordingly, I agree to that extent with the reasoning of that opinion, and I concur in the conclusion that the judgment of the trial court granting the defendant's motion to strike should be affirmed.