

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

RICHARD GATES *v.* ESLA EUGENE GATES ET AL.  
(AC 30249)

Flynn, C. J., and Lavine and Hennessy, Js.

Argued April 21—officially released June 23, 2009

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of  
Ansonia-Milford, Tyme, J.)

*Robert H. Boynton*, for the appellant (plaintiff).

*Steven D. Ecker*, with whom, on the brief, was *Gavin  
F. Meehan*, for the appellees (defendants).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Richard Gates, appeals from the judgment of the trial court dismissing his appeal from the judgment of the Probate Court. On appeal, the plaintiff claims that the court improperly concluded that it was without subject matter jurisdiction over the appeal due to the plaintiff's failure to file his complaint with the Superior Court within thirty days of the mailing of the Probate Court's memorandum of decision, as required by General Statutes § 45a-186 (a).

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 issue 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 *Gates v. Gates*, 51 Conn. Sup. 148, A.2d (2008). 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.

---