

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

FRANCES D. SIVEK *v.* JANE BALJEVIC  
(AC 19298)

Schaller, Spear and Pellegrino, Js.

Argued May 8—officially released September 19, 2000

Counsel

*Norman A. Pattis*, with whom, on the brief, was *John R. Williams*, for the appellant (plaintiff).

*Warren L. Holcomb*, for the appellee (defendant).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Frances D. Sivek, appeals from the summary judgment rendered in favor of the defendant, Jane Baljevic. The plaintiff, at the relevant times, was a teacher in the Milford public schools and the defendant was the school principal. The plaintiff brought an action against the defendant claiming that the defendant’s actions in meeting with her and, thereafter, in placing a memorandum in the defendant’s personal file constituted punishment of her for exercising her first amendment rights to free speech and inflicted severe emotional distress on her. The parents of one of the plaintiff’s students had complained to the defendant that the plaintiff had made an allegedly

racist comment in class. This complaint precipitated the meeting with the defendant and the subsequent memorandum.

Our examination of the record and briefs and our consideration of the arguments of the parties persuades us that the judgment of the trial court should be affirmed. The issues presented were resolved properly in the trial court's thoughtful and comprehensive memorandum of decision. See *Sivek v. Baljevic*, 46 Conn. Sup. 518, A.2d (1999). Because that memorandum of decision fully addresses the arguments raised in this appeal, we adopt it as a proper statement of the facts and the applicable law on those issues. It would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained therein. *East v. Labbe*, 54 Conn. App. 479, 480–81, 735 A.2d 370 (1999), *aff'd*, 252 Conn. 359, 746 A.2d 751 (2000).

The judgment is affirmed.