
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.

CARLTON JOLLEY *v.* CAPTAIN VINTON ET AL.
(AC 38826)

Alvord, Keller and Beach, Js.

Submitted on briefs January 6—officially released March 14, 2017

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Hartford, Dubay, J.)

Carlton Jolley, self-represented, the appellant (plaintiff), filed a brief.

George Jepsen, attorney general, and *Neil Parille*, assistant attorney general, filed a brief for the appellees (defendants).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Carlton Jolley, appeals to this court claiming that the trial court improperly granted the motion to dismiss filed by the defendants, Captain Brian Vinton and Attorney General George Jepsen, based on statutory and sovereign immunity. The defendants claim that the court correctly granted the motion to dismiss with respect to Jepsen, but concede that the court should not have granted the motion to dismiss with respect to Vinton. After a careful review of the briefs to this court and the record, and in light of the defendants' concession, we agree with the defendants.

The judgment of dismissal as to Vinton is reversed and the case is remanded for further proceedings according to law. The judgment is affirmed in all other respects.
