
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.

COMPUTERWORKS, INC. v. BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE TOWN OF LEDYARD ET AL.
(AC 19466)

Foti, Zarella and O’Connell, Js.

Argued June 2—officially released August 22, 2000

Counsel

Victor J. Spata, Jr., for the appellant (plaintiff).

Hugh Cuthbertson, with whom were *Jody P. Benbow* and, on the brief, *Frederick L. Dorsey*, for the appellees (defendants).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The controlling issue in this appeal is whether the trial court properly rendered judgment dismissing the second count of the plaintiff’s complaint. The sole reference to the second count in the trial court’s memorandum of decision is as follows: “The plaintiff’s argument that the second count should survive a motion to dismiss is unavailing.” The plaintiff did not seek an articulation of this naked declaration.

“Under these circumstances, we . . . are left to surmise or speculate as to the existence of a factual predi-

cate for the trial court's rulings. Our role is not to guess at possibilities, but to review claims based on a complete factual record developed by the trial court. . . . Without the necessary factual and legal conclusions furnished by the trial court . . . any decision made by us respecting [the plaintiff's claim] would be entirely speculative." (Internal quotation mark omitted.) *Chase Manhattan Bank/City Trust v. AECO Elevator Co.*, 48 Conn. App. 605, 608, 710 A.2d 190 (1998), quoting *Alix v. Leech*, 45 Conn. App. 1, 5, 692 A.2d 1309 (1997). "The duty to provide this court with a record adequate for review rests with the appellant. Practice Book § 60-5" (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Lombardi v. Lombardi*, 55 Conn. App. 117, 118, 737 A.2d 988 (1999), cert. denied, 252 Conn. 943, 747 A.2d 520 (2000).

The judgment is affirmed.
