

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

NANCY BURTON v. STATEWIDE  
GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE  
(AC 23132)

Dranginis, Bishop and Dupont, Js.

Argued May 6—officially released September 9, 2003

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of New  
Britain, Quinn, J.)

*Nancy Burton*, pro se, the appellant (plaintiff).

*Michael P. Bowler*, assistant bar counsel, for the  
appellee (defendant).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Nancy Burton, appeals from the judgment of the trial court dismissing her appeal from the reprimand issued to her by the defendant, the statewide grievance committee (committee). The committee had affirmed the decision of its reviewing committee, reprimanding the plaintiff for a violation of rule 8.2 (a) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.<sup>1</sup>

The plaintiff claims that the court improperly concluded (1) that the record supported the factual findings of the committee by clear and convincing proof, and (2) that the statements she made that were found to be in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct were not protected by the first amendment to the United States constitution.<sup>2</sup>

Our examination of the record and briefs and our consideration of the arguments of the parties persuades us that the judgment should be affirmed. The issues were resolved properly in the court's complete and well reasoned memorandum of decision. See *Burton v. Statewide Grievance Committee*, 48 Conn. Sup. , A.2d (2002). Because that memorandum of decision fully addressed the arguments raised in this appeal, we adopt it as the proper statement of the issues and the applicable law concerning those issues. It would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained therein. See *Smith v. Trinity United Methodist Church of Springfield, Massachusetts*, 263 Conn. 135, 136, 819 A.2d 225 (2003), citing *Davis v. Freedom of Information Commission*, 259 Conn. 45, 55–56, 787

A.2d 530 (2002).

**The judgment is affirmed.**

<sup>1</sup> Rule 8.2 (a) of the Rules of Professional Conduct provides: “A lawyer shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge, adjudicatory officer or public legal officer, or of a candidate for election or appointment to judicial or legal office.”

<sup>2</sup> The plaintiff also claimed that there was a due process violation in the grievance proceedings, which flowed from a due process violation that was found in *Burton v. Statewide Grievance Committee*, 60 Conn. App. 698, 760 A.2d 1027 (2000). The plaintiff’s brief contains insufficient legal analysis and authority for that claim. Accordingly, we will not afford it review. See *State v. Davila*, 75 Conn. App. 432, 441 n.6, 816 A.2d 673, cert. denied, 264 Conn. 909, 826 A.2d 180 (2003).

---