
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.

ANDREA BUCCHERE ET AL. *v.* BRINKER
INTERNATIONAL, INC., ET AL.
(SC 17770)

AMARILIS OROZCO ET AL. *v.* DARDEN
RESTAURANTS, INC.
(SC 17771)

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

Submitted May 13—officially released July 8, 2008

Anthony J. Pantuso III, Richard E. Hayber, Daniel S. Blinn, Sarah Poriss and William Madsen, for the appellants (plaintiffs in both cases).

Margaret J. Strange, for the appellees (defendants in the first case, defendant in the second case).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiffs unsuccessfully sought orders granting them class certification in actions in which they claimed that the defendants had failed to pay them the required minimum wage. After the trial court denied the plaintiffs' requests for class certification, they appealed to the Appellate Court. That court dismissed the appeals for lack of a final judgment, and we granted certification on the question of whether an order denying class certification is a final judgment.¹ In *Palmer v. Friendly Ice Cream Corp.*, 285 Conn. 462, 482, 940 A.2d 742 (2008), we answered that question by holding that such an order is not a final judgment. After ordering the parties to file briefs on why the Appellate Court's judgments of dismissal should not be affirmed in light of our decision in that case, we now affirm the Appellate Court's judgments.

The judgments of the Appellate Court are affirmed.

¹ In both of these cases, we granted the plaintiffs' petitions for certification to appeal, limited to the following issue: "Is an order denying a motion for class certification a final judgment for purposes of appeal?" *Buchere v. Brinker International, Inc.*, 280 Conn. 938, 910 A.2d 217 (2006); *Orozco v. Darden Restaurants, Inc.*, 280 Conn. 939, 910 A.2d 218 (2006).
