
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.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT *v.* ANDRE D. MARTIN
(SC 18261)

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

Argued February 11—officially released March 23, 2010

C. Robert Satti, Jr., senior assistant state's attorney, with whom, on the brief, were *John C. Smriga*, state's attorney, and *Jonathan C. Benedict*, former state's attorney, for the appellant (state).

Arthur L. Ledford, special public defender, for the appellee (defendant).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The state appeals, upon our grant of its petition for certification,¹ from the judgment of the Appellate Court reversing in part the judgment of conviction and remanding the case to the trial court with direction to merge the conviction of attempted possession of one kilogram or more of marijuana with intent to sell by a person who is not drug-dependent in violation of General Statutes §§ 21a-278 (b) and 53a-49, with the conviction of possession of four ounces or more of marijuana in violation of General Statutes § 21a-279 (b), and vacating the sentence for possession of four ounces or more of marijuana.² *State v. Martin*, 110 Conn. App. 171, 180–81, 954 A.2d 256 (2008). The Appellate Court determined that the two convictions violated the proscription against double jeopardy contained in the fifth amendment to the United States constitution and that they, therefore, must be merged, because, but for the actions of the police, the defendant, Andre D. Martin, would not have been charged with both offenses. *Id.*, 177–79.

In its certified appeal to this court, the state claims that the Appellate Court applied an improper legal standard in assessing the defendant's double jeopardy claims. 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.

¹ We granted the state's petition for certification to appeal limited to the following issue: "Did the Appellate Court correctly conclude that a conviction for possession of four ounces or more of marijuana in violation of General Statutes § 21a-279 (b) should be merged with the conviction of attempt to possess one kilogram or more of marijuana with the intent to sell in violation of General Statutes §§ 21a-278 (b) and 53a-49?" *State v. Martin*, 289 Conn. 944, 959 A.2d 1010 (2008).

² The defendant was also convicted of conspiracy to possess a kilogram or more of marijuana with intent to sell in violation of General Statutes §§ 21a-277 (b), 21a-278 (b) and 53a-48. This conviction is not at issue in this appeal.
