

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

SULLIVAN, C. J., and ZARELLA, J., dissenting. We respectfully dissent from the majority opinion. We would conclude that the complaint of the plaintiff, the office of the governor of Connecticut, seeking to quash the subpoena issued by the defendant, the select committee of inquiry to recommend whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to impeach Governor John G. Rowland pursuant to article ninth of the state constitution, should be dismissed as premature. This conclusion is compelled by our state constitution's speech or debate clause and by the separation of powers doctrine. In our view, the court should not reach out and decide difficult constitutional questions involving the balance of powers between the legislature and the chief executive in the absence of an immediate and compelling need to do so. Accordingly, for reasons that we will discuss more fully in due course, we believe that the case should be remanded to the trial court with direction to dismiss the plaintiff's complaint.

---