

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

THOMAS F. DESTEPH *v.* DEPARTMENT OF BANKING  
(AC 34465)

Gruendel, Alvord and Flynn, Js.

*Argued March 4—officially released April 9, 2013*

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

*Thomas F. DeSteph*, pro se, the appellant (plaintiff).

*Patrick T. Ring*, assistant attorney general, with  
whom, on the brief, was *George Jepsen*, attorney gen-  
eral, for the appellee (defendant).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. In this case, the plaintiff, Thomas F. DeSteph, filed an appeal from the final decision of the defendant, Howard F. Pitkin, commissioner of the department of banking, which made permanent a cease and desist order issued to the plaintiff relating to the sale of securities in violation of the Connecticut Uniform Securities Act, General Statutes § 36b-2 et seq., and regulations promulgated thereunder, and imposed a fine of \$30,000 for three violations of it. The trial court rendered judgment dismissing the appeal.

Our examination of the record and briefs and our consideration of the arguments of the parties persuade us that the judgment should be affirmed. On the facts of this case, the issues properly were resolved in the complete and well reasoned memorandum of decision by the trial court, *Cohn, J. See DeSteph v. Dept. of Banking*, 52 Conn. Sup. 550, A.3d (2012). We therefore adopt it as the proper statement of the relevant facts, issues and applicable law, as it would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained therein. See *Nestico v. Weyman*, 140 Conn. App. 499, 500, 59 A.3d 337 (2013).

The judgment is affirmed.

---