
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.

BEACH, J., concurring. I concur in the well reasoned opinion of the majority. I write separately only with respect to part IV, in which the majority affirms the admissibility of the decision of the Freedom of Information Commission. As a general proposition, decisions of administrative agencies, or of courts, for that matter, are not admissible to prove matters stated therein. See, e.g., *Heritage Village Master Assn., Inc. v. Heritage Village Water Co.*, 30 Conn. App. 693, 701, 622 A.2d 578 (1993) (“Unless a prior adjudication satisfies the usual requirements of *res judicata* or collateral estoppel, a determination of a fact in one case is not admissible in another case to prove the same fact. . . . The final administrative determination, therefore, was hearsay evidence that does not fall into any recognized exception.” [Citation omitted.]); see also C. Tait & E. Prescott, *Connecticut Evidence* (5th Ed. 2014) § 8.22.10, p. 589.

This proposition, however, was not specifically briefed or argued before us, nor does it appear from the record that the point was distinctly raised in the trial court. In these circumstances, I agree with the majority’s deciding only the issues presented to this court. See *Blumberg Associates Worldwide v. Brown & Brown of Connecticut, Inc.*, 311 Conn. 123, 141–44, 84 A.3d 840 (2014).

I therefore respectfully concur.
