

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

STATE OF CONNECTICUT *v.* KHALID IBRAHIM  
(AC 19707)

Lavery, C. J., and Spear and Daly, Js.

Argued December 14, 2000—officially released April 10, 2001

Counsel

*Neal Cone*, assistant public defender, for the appellant (defendant).

*Mitchell S. Brody*, assistant state’s attorney, with whom, on the brief, were *James E. Thomas*, state’s attorney, and *Dennis J. O’Connor*, senior assistant state’s attorney, for the appellee (state).

PER CURIAM. The defendant, Khalid Ibrahim, appeals from the judgment of conviction, rendered after a jury trial, of felony murder in violation of General Statutes § 53a-54c and kidnapping in the first degree in violation of General Statutes § 53a-92 (a) (2) (A). The defendant’s claims are virtually identical to the claims raised in *State v. Vicente*, 62 Conn. App. 625, A.2d (2001).<sup>1</sup> We, therefore, dispose of the claims here in the same fashion and for the same reasons as in *State v. Vicente*, *supra*, 625.

The judgment is affirmed.

<sup>1</sup> The briefs of the defendants in both cases are also virtually identical.