

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

FILOMENA REES *v.* ELLEN J. VILLANO ET AL.  
(AC 34753)

DiPentima, C. J., and Alvord and Harper, Js.

Argued May 28—officially released July 9, 2013

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of  
Ansonia-Milford, Hon. John W. Moran, judge trial  
referee.)

*Peter R. Stark*, with whom, on the brief, was *Edward  
S. Noble III*, for the appellants (defendants).

*David C. Pite*, for the appellee (plaintiff).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The defendants Ellen J. Villano and Anthony Villano appeal from the judgment of strict foreclosure rendered by the trial court in favor of the plaintiff Filomena Rees. On appeal, the defendants claim that the court improperly precluded them from presenting an expert witness. After reviewing the record and appellate briefs, we conclude that the defendants' claim is without merit and that the court properly rendered a judgment of strict foreclosure in favor of the plaintiff.

The judgment is affirmed and the case is remanded for the purpose of setting new law days.

---