
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.

FLYNN, C. J., concurring. I agree with the comprehensive, thoughtful and well reasoned opinion of the majority. I write separately to emphasize that my concurrence as to the standing of the petitioner, Johnathan Bell, to bring this action, rests on more narrow grounds. The petitioner's standing, although he is not a party to the foreclosure action in which the documents were sealed, rests on the fact that, as a member of the public, he has a right to know, see and access documents filed with the court as part of a summary judgment motion. They are judicial documents; see *Rosado v. Bridgeport Roman Catholic Diocesan Corp.*, 292 Conn. 1, 46, 970 A.2d 656 (2009) ("any document filed that a court reasonably may rely on in support of its adjudicatory function is a judicial document"); and, therefore, they are presumed to be open to the public's inspection. See Practice Book § 11-20A.

In one portion of the majority opinion, the majority states: "In view of the presumption of the openness of court proceedings and that judicial documents are to be available for public inspection, *the petitioner's status as a resident of the subject property, the husband of the defendant [Sonja V. Bell] and the father of the children living there*, we conclude that the petitioner has standing . . ." (Emphasis added.) The petitioner's right, however, is not dependent in any way on his marriage to the defendant Sonja Bell, his tenancy in the premises being foreclosed, or his being a parent of the children living there. In my opinion, the petitioner's right to know and use these documents and, therefore, his standing to bring this petition is dependent only on his right of access as a member of the general public and not in any way on his spousal relationship or where he and his children live. It is on that basis, that I concur.
