

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

CHARLES AMO v. ROBERT J. PINCINCE ET AL.  
(SC 16264)

Borden, Katz, Palmer, Ronan and Flynn, Js.

Argued October 24—officially released November 21, 2000

Counsel

*Thomas G. Benneche*, for the appellant (plaintiff).

*John H. Parks*, for the appellee (named defendant et al.).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. In this mechanic’s lien foreclosure action, we granted the petition of the plaintiff, Charles Amo, for certification to appeal from the judgment of the Appellate Court affirming the trial court’s granting of the motion of the defendants, Robert J. Pincince and Joan C. Pincince,<sup>1</sup> to open the judgment of strict foreclosure.<sup>2</sup> *Amo v. Pincince*, 55 Conn. App. 767, 740 A.2d 895 (1999). After reviewing the 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.

<sup>1</sup> Ernest Lloyd was impleaded as a defendant in the trial court, but he is not involved in this appeal.

<sup>2</sup> We granted the plaintiff's petition for certification to appeal limited to the following issues: (1) "Did the Appellate Court properly decline to review the plaintiff's claim based on an inadequate record, where the plaintiff appealed the issue of the trial court's jurisdiction to open a foreclosure judgment after title to the property had passed from the defendants, and the record included the judgment of foreclosure, the passing of the law days, the vesting of title in another party, the motion to open judgment being filed after title had vested, and the decision granting the motion over the plaintiff's jurisdictional argument being entered after title had vested?"

(2) "Whether the Appellate Court, in light of General Statutes § 49-15, properly affirmed the trial court's order granting a motion to open a foreclosure judgment, when the motion was filed, and the decision granting it was rendered, after title to the subject property had vested in another party?" *Amo v. Pincince*, 252 Conn. 934, 747 A.2d 1 (2000).

---