
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.

WILLIAM H. REID *v.* COMMISSIONER OF CORRECTION
TIONS
(AC 19628)

Lavery, C. J., and Landau and Pellegrino, Js.

Submitted on briefs October 18—officially released November 28, 2000

Counsel

Deborah G. Stevenson, special public defender, filed a brief for the appellant (petitioner).

James E. Thomas, state’s attorney, and *Terence Mariani* and *John A. East III*, assistant state’s attorneys, filed a brief for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The petitioner, William H. Reid, appeals from the judgment of the habeas court denying his amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus and denying his request for certification to appeal to this court. On appeal, the petitioner claims that the habeas court (1) abused its discretion when it denied the petition for certification to appeal from the denial of the amended petition and (2) improperly determined that he was not deprived of the effective assistance of counsel. We dismiss the appeal.

After reviewing the record and briefs, we conclude that the petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing that he was denied a state or federal constitutional right. Furthermore, the petitioner has failed to sustain his burden of persuasion that the denial of certification to appeal was a clear abuse of discretion or that an injustice has been done. See *Simms v. Warden*, 230 Conn. 608, 612, 646 A.2d 126 (1994); *Simms v. Warden*, 229 Conn. 178, 189, 640 A.2d 601 (1994); *Walker v. Commissioner of Correction*, 38 Conn. App. 99, 100, 659 A.2d 195, cert. denied, 234 Conn. 920, 661 A.2d 100 (1995); see also *Lozada v. Deeds*, 498 U.S. 430, 431–32, 111 S. Ct. 860, 112 L. Ed. 2d 956 (1991).

The habeas court’s denial of the petitioner’s petition was predicated on a factual review of the petitioner’s claim and a determination that he had failed to rebut the “strong presumption that counsel’s conduct [fell] within the wide range of reasonable professional assistance” *Safford v. Warden*, 223 Conn. 180, 193, 612 A.2d 1161 (1992). We conclude that the habeas court had before it sufficient evidence to support its finding and that it did not abuse its discretion in denying the petitioner’s petition for certification to appeal.

The appeal is dismissed.
