## 

The "officially released" date that appears near the beginning of each opinion is the date the opinion will be published in the <u>Connecticut Law Journal</u> 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.

## SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE COMPANY v. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL (SC 16582)

Sullivan, C. J., and Katz, Palmer, Vertefeuille and Zarella, Js. Argued March 14—officially released April 30, 2002

## Ralph G. Elliot, for the appellant (plaintiff).

*Tatiana D. Eirmann*, assistant attorney general, with whom, on the brief, was *Richard Blumenthal*, attorney general, for the appellee (defendant).

## Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Southern New England Telephone Company, appeals, following our grant of certification to appeal, from the judgment of the Appellate Court affirming the trial court's dismissal of the plaintiff's administrative appeal for lack of a final decision by the defendant, the department of public utility control. *Southern New England Telephone Co.* v. *Dept of Public Utility Control*, 64 Conn. App. 134, 779 A.2d 817 (2001). We granted the plaintiff's petition for certification to appeal limited to the following issue: "Did the Appellate Court properly conclude that the trial court properly dismissed the plaintiff's administrative appeal?" Southern New England Telephone Co. v. Dept. *of Public Utility Control*, 258 Conn. 922, 782 A.2d 1252 (2001).

After examining the entire record on appeal and considering the briefs and oral arguments of the parties, we have determined that the appeal in this case should be dismissed on the ground that certification was improvidently granted.

The appeal is dismissed.