
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.

CITIBANK (SOUTH DAKOTA) N.A. *v.* RICHARD
M. FARINA
(AC 32670)

Gruendel, Lavine and Espinosa, Js.

Argued January 10—officially released January 31, 2012

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

Richard M. Farina, pro se, the appellant (defendant).

Julie B. Solomon, for the appellee (plaintiff).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. In this action to collect on an unpaid credit card debt of approximately \$15,000, the self-represented defendant, Richard M. Farina, appeals from the trial court's denial of his motion to open and to vacate the judgment. We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

On May 12, 2009, the plaintiff, Citibank (South Dakota) N.A., filed its complaint. On October 21, 2009, the court granted the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment. The defendant timely filed an appeal in this court, which affirmed the judgment of the trial court. *Citibank (South Dakota) N.A. v. Farina*, 122 Conn. App. 901, 995 A.2d 649, cert. denied, 299 Conn. 901, 10 A.3d 519 (2010).

Less than two months after this court's decision was issued, the defendant filed a motion to open and to vacate the judgment. On September 2, 2010, the trial court denied the defendant's motion and sustained the plaintiff's objection to it. In its articulation of its ruling, the trial court made a finding that the issues raised by the defendant in his motion were frivolous.

Although the issues framed in the defendant's statement of issues are, on their face, cogent, his analysis of them is not. Like the trial court, we conclude that the issues raised by the defendant are frivolous. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

The judgment is affirmed.
