
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.

GAIL H. MUNSON *v.* ROBERT J. MUNSON
(AC 26351)

DiPentima, Gruendel and Harper, Js.

Argued September 26—officially released December 26, 2006

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of Hartford, Hon. Simon S. Cohen, judge trial referee; Hon. John R. Caruso, judge trial referee.)

Steven R. Dembo, with whom, on the brief, was *P. Jo Anne Burgh*, for the appellant (defendant).

Campbell D. Barrett, with whom were *Heather St. Germain*, certified legal intern, and, on the brief, *C. Michael Budlong* and *Kevin W. Hadfield*, certified legal intern, for the appellee (plaintiff).

Opinion

DiPENTIMA, J. The defendant, Robert J. Munson, appeals from the judgment of the trial court denying his motion for modification of child support. On appeal, the defendant claims that the judgment must be

The court has not provided a clear factual record by which we can review its judgment. The crucial findings of fact in the memorandum of decision are inconsistent and irreconcilable, and the articulation obfuscates rather than clarifies the court's reasoning. Consequently, we conclude that the motion must be relitigated, and the factual question of the children's residence must be resolved for a determination of the disputed financial issues. See *State v. Wilson*, supra, 199 Conn. 445; *Leslie v. Leslie*, 174 Conn. 399, 404, 389 A.2d 747 (1978).

The judgment denying the defendant's motion for modification of child support is reversed and the case is remanded for a new hearing.

In this opinion the other judges concurred.