
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.

PAUL T. CONEE *v.* DEPARTMENT
OF SOCIAL SERVICES
(AC 35878)

DiPentima, C. J., and Sheldon and Norcott, Js.

Argued November 20, 2014—officially released March 10, 2015

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of New
Britain, Cohn, J.)

Paul T. Conee, self-represented, the appellant
(plaintiff).

Hugh Barber, assistant attorney general, with whom,
on the brief, were *George Jepsen*, attorney general, and
Nicole Palermo, legal intern, for the appellee
(defendant).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Paul T. Conee, appeals from the judgment of the trial court dismissing his appeal from the decision of the defendant, the Department of Social Services, rejecting his claim that his benefits under the defendant's Aid to the Aged, Blind, and Disabled program were incorrectly calculated. On appeal, the plaintiff claims that the court improperly concluded that (1) there was substantial evidence to support the defendant's decision, and (2) the defendant did not violate the plaintiff's right to equal protection under the federal and state constitutions.¹

After examining the record and the briefs and considering the arguments of the parties, we are persuaded that the trial court, *Cohn, J.*, properly dismissed the plaintiff's appeal. The issues raised by the plaintiff were resolved properly in the court's thorough and well reasoned memorandum of decision. See *Conee v. Dept. of Social Services*, 53 Conn. Supp. 322, A.3d (2013). We therefore adopt the court's memorandum of decision as the proper statement of the relevant facts, issues and applicable law, as it would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained therein. See *Pellecchia v. Killingly*, 147 Conn. App. 299, 301–302, 80 A.3d 931 (2013).

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ The plaintiff also raised a claim for the first time before the trial court that the defendant violated his right to travel under the federal constitution. The trial court declined to review this claim, as it was not raised at the administrative hearing. We also decline to review this claim for the same reason. See *Finkenstein v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act*, 192 Conn. 104, 112, 470 A.2d 1196 (1984) (declining to review claim that was not properly raised before board of review).
