****

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.

****

ZARELLA, J., with whom SULLIVAN, C. J., joins, concurring. I agree with the majority that General Statutes § 52-557n (a) (1) ''clearly and expressly abrogates the traditional common-law doctrine in this state that municipalities are immune from suit for torts committed by their employees and agents. . . . Therefore, the legislature has manifested its intention to abrogate governmental immunity under the statute.'' (Citations omitted.) I also concur in the result.

I write separately to note my agreement with the majority insofar as it has declined to extend further the purposive approach to statutory interpretation first announced in *State* v. *Courchesne*, 262 Conn. 537, 577–78, A.2d (2003). The purposive approach requires the statutory interpreter to consider all of the circumstances surrounding the enactment of the legislation in attempting to divine the legislative intent even when the language of the statute under interpretation is clear and unambiguous. See id., 566, 577.

Specifically, I agree with the majority's rejection of the defendants' argument that the lack of any relevant legislative debate on § 52-557n (a) (1) suggests that the legislature did not intend to abrogate the common law. This seems to be a straightforward application of the common sense notion that, when the legislature speaks ''clearly and expressly,'' there is no further requirement that the legislative history also affirmatively reflect that expressed intent. In short, I agree with the majority's rejection of the theory that nothing means something. Finally, I would only note that, in light of the majority's conclusion that the legislature has spoken ''clearly and expressly,'' even affirmative legislative history favoring the defendants' interpretation should not change the result in this case. Cf. *W & D Acquisitions, LLC* v. *First Union National Bank*, 262 Conn. 704, 718, A.2d (2003) (*Zarella, J.*, concurring).

Accordingly, I concur.