

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

RASHEEN GIRAUD *v.* STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
(AC 31344)

DiPentima, C. J., and Sheldon and Dupont, Js.

*Argued May 31—officially released August 21, 2012*

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

*Lauren Weisfeld*, assistant public defender, for the  
appellant (petitioner).

*Leonard C. Boyle*, deputy chief state's attorney, with  
whom, on the brief, were *Gail P. Hardy*, state's attorney,  
*Raheem L. Mullins*, assistant state's attorney, and  
*Dennis O'Connor*, former senior assistant state's attorney,  
for the appellee (state).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The petitioner, Rasheen Giraud, appeals from the judgment of the trial court denying his petition for a new trial on criminal charges of murder in violation of General Statutes § 53a-54a, felony murder in violation of General Statutes § 53a-54c, robbery in the first degree in violation of General Statutes § 53a-134 (a) (2), larceny in the second degree in violation of General Statutes § 53a-123 (a) (1), and kidnapping in the first degree in violation of General Statutes § 53a-92 (a) (2) (B), of which he was found guilty following a jury trial. After he was sentenced on those charges to a total effective sentence of eighty-five years incarceration, his judgment of conviction was affirmed by our Supreme Court on direct appeal. See *State v. Giraud*, 258 Conn. 631, 632, 783 A.2d 1019 (2001).

In his petition for a new trial, the petitioner claimed that there was newly discovered evidence of posttrial admissions by one of the state's key witnesses in his criminal trial that showed that that witness had lied in his testimony at trial. The petitioner claimed that the posttrial admissions of the witness so undermined his credibility as to warrant a new trial. Following a hearing, the court issued a memorandum of decision denying the petition for a new trial. The court thereafter granted the petitioner's petition for certification to appeal its decision.

We have examined the record on appeal and considered the briefs and the arguments of the parties and conclude that the judgment of the trial court should be affirmed. Because the trial court thoroughly addressed the arguments raised in this appeal, we adopt its well reasoned decision as a statement of the facts and the applicable law on the issue. See *Giraud v. State*, 52 Conn. Sup. , A.3d (2011). Any further discussion by this court would serve no useful purpose. See, e.g., *Woodruff v. Hemingway*, 297 Conn. 317, 321, 2 A.3d 857 (2010).

The judgment is affirmed.

---