
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.

JO-ANN JACKSON *v.* PASCALE P. LEE
(AC 31182)

Bishop, Beach and West, Js.

Argued April 6—officially released May 25, 2010

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Stamford-Norwalk, Mintz, J.)

Matthew B. Woods, for the appellant (defendant).

Stephen J. Conover, with whom was *Susan R. Briggs*,
for the appellee (plaintiff).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. In this quiet title action, the defendant Pascale P. Lee¹ appeals from the judgment of the trial court rendered in favor of the plaintiff, Jo-Ann Jackson, declaring that the plaintiff had acquired a prescriptive easement over a portion of the defendant's real property.² The defendant claims that the evidence was insufficient to support the court's finding that the plaintiff had established all of the elements of a prescriptive easement.

After examining the record on appeal and considering the briefs and the arguments of the parties, we conclude that the judgment of the trial court should be affirmed. Because the court's memorandum of decision resolves properly the issues raised in this appeal, we adopt the court's concise and well reasoned decision as a statement of the facts and the applicable law on the issue. See *Jackson v. Lee*, 51 Conn. Sup. , A.2d (2009). Any further discussion by this court would serve no useful purpose. See, e.g., *Socha v. Bordeau*, 289 Conn. 358, 362, 956 A.2d 1174 (2008).

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ Wachovia Mortgage Corporation is also a defendant in this action. Because, however, it is not a party to this appeal, we refer to Pascale P. Lee as the defendant.

² Although the plaintiff filed an eight count complaint seeking relief, she prevailed only as to her claim for a prescriptive easement over a portion of the defendant's property. The plaintiff is not challenging the court's decision on appeal.
