
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.

JOHN GIROLAMETTI, JR. *v.* RIZZO CORPORATION
(AC 34547)

Lavine, Alvord and Bear, Js.

Argued May 23—officially released July 9, 2013

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Danbury, Wenzel, J.)

Michael J. Barnaby, for the appellant (plaintiff).

Daniel J. Krisch, with whom, on the brief, was *Alfred
A. DiVincentis*, for the appellee (defendant).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, John Girolametti, Jr., appeals from the judgment of the trial court dismissing his application to vacate an arbitration award issued in favor of the defendant, Rizzo Corporation, on the ground that it was not filed within thirty days of the notification of the arbitration award as required by General Statutes § 52-420 (b).¹ On appeal, the plaintiff claims that the court improperly concluded that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over his application because the statutory time limitation for filing his application was extended by the defendant's having filed a motion with the arbitrator to modify the award, and his application properly was filed within thirty days of the issuance of the modified award. We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

In ruling on the defendant's motion to dismiss, the court issued a memorandum of decision that concisely and thoughtfully states the facts and the applicable law. See *Girolametti v. Rizzo Corp.*, 52 Conn. Supp. _____, A.3d _____ (2012). After examining the record and the briefs and considering the arguments of the parties on appeal, we are persuaded that the court correctly determined that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over the plaintiff's application. We, therefore, adopt the court's thorough and well reasoned memorandum of decision as the proper statement of the relevant facts, issues and applicable law. See *id.* No useful purpose would be served by repeating that discussion here. See, e.g., *Council 4, AFSCME, AFL-CIO v. State Ethics Commission*, 304 Conn. 672, 673, 41 A.3d 656 (2012); *Tuite v. Hospital of Central Connecticut*, 141 Conn. App. 573, 575, 61 A.3d 1187 (2013).

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ General Statutes § 52-420 (b) provides: "No motion to vacate, modify or correct an award may be made after thirty days from the notice of the award to the party to the arbitration who makes the motion."
