
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.

RICHARD SZCZAPA *v.* UNITED PARCEL
SERVICE, INC., ET AL.
(SC 16942)

Borden, Norcott, Katz, Vertefeuille and Zarella, Js.

Argued January 15—officially released February 24, 2004

Neil Johnson, for the appellant (plaintiff).

Karen K. Clark, with whom, on the brief, was *Richard J. Kenny*, for the appellee (named defendant).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Richard Szczapa, appeals, following our grant of certification, from the order of the Appellate Court granting the motion of the named defendant, United Parcel Service, Inc., to dismiss the appeal of the plaintiff from the judgment of the trial court rendered in favor of the named defendant. We granted the plaintiff's petition for certification for appeal limited to the following issue: "Did the Appellate Court properly dismiss this appeal?" *Szczapa v. United Parcel Service, Inc.*, 262 Conn. 952, 817 A.2d 111 (2003).

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.
