

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

DRANGINIS, J., concurring. I agree with the majority that the plaintiff in error, the office of the chief public defender of the state of Connecticut, cannot participate as next friend of the defendant, Michael B. Ross, or as amicus curiae in postconviction proceedings in the cases against the defendant. I also fully agree, however, with Justice Norcott that the pending consolidated habeas corpus litigation regarding the influence of race in the application of our death penalty statute raises the prospect that the imminent imposition of the death penalty in this case will be revealed, in the foreseeable future, as having resulted from a fundamentally flawed system. I concur separately only because, unlike Justice Norcott, I do not believe the death penalty to be unconstitutional in all situations.

---