
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.

KAREN M. BUDAHAZY *v.* JAY R. BUDAHAZY
(AC 31725)

Bishop, Lavine and Bear, Js.

Argued January 13—officially released March 15, 2011

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Litchfield, Roche, J.)

Jay R. Budahazy, pro se, the appellant (defendant).

Stephanie M. Weaver, for the appellee (plaintiff).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The defendant, Jay R. Budahazy, appeals from the judgment of the trial court dissolving his marriage to the plaintiff, Karen M. Budahazy, and issuing certain financial orders, including awarding attorney's fees to the plaintiff. After a careful review of the trial court record and the briefs and oral arguments of the parties in this matter, we conclude that the defendant has not sustained his burden with respect to any of the eight "[p]rincipal [i]ssues" he raises in his appeal.

The judgment is affirmed.
