
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.

MITCHELL HENDERSON *v.* COMMISSIONER OF
CORRECTION
(AC 20967)

Schaller, Mihalakos and O’Connell, Js.

Submitted on briefs September 12—officially released November 13, 2001

Counsel

Mitchell Henderson, pro se, the appellant (petitioner) filed a brief.

Richard Blumenthal, attorney general, and *Richard T. Biggar*, assistant attorney general, filed a brief for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The petitioner appeals following the denial by the habeas court of his petition for certification to appeal from the court’s judgment denying his habeas corpus petition.¹ After reviewing the record and briefs, we conclude that the petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing that he has been denied a state or federal constitutional right and, further, 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. War-*

den, 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, 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. 869, 112 L. Ed. 2d 956 (1991). We therefore dismiss the appeal.

In his petition for a writ of habeas corpus, the petitioner claimed that the commissioner of correction denied the petitioner's liberty interest in the extended family visitation program. The habeas court properly concluded that the petitioner does not have a liberty interest in access to visitors. *Santiago v. Commissioner of Correction*, 39 Conn. App. 674, 680, 667 A.2d 304 (1995); see also *Kentucky Dept. of Corrections v. Thompson*, 490 U.S. 454, 460–61, 109 S. Ct. 1904, 104 L. Ed. 2d 506 (1989). Furthermore, department of correction Administrative Directive § 10.6 provides in relevant part that "visitation shall be considered a privilege and no inmate shall have entitlement to a visit." The court, therefore, did not abuse its discretion in denying the petition for certification to appeal.

The appeal is dismissed.

¹ While the petitioner's appellate brief states the issue of whether the habeas court improperly denied his petition for a writ of mandamus, his brief does not address that question. "An issue merely mentioned will be deemed abandoned." *State v. Wragg*, 61 Conn. App. 394, 395 n.1, 764 A.2d 216 (2001). We therefore do not address that claim.
