
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.

MARY CUYLER *v.* BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE
CITY OF DANBURY
(AC 19203)

Spear, Hennessy and Mihalakos, Js.

Submitted on the briefs March 21—officially released August 15, 2000

Counsel

A. Scott Falls filed a brief for the appellants (plaintiffs).

Mark J. Sommaruga filed a brief for the appellee (defendant).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiffs¹ appeal from the summary judgment rendered in favor of the defendant, the board of education of the city of Danbury. The plaintiffs claim that the trial court improperly ruled that they had failed to exhaust their administrative remedies and that their claims were covered under the collective bargaining agreement. The plaintiffs also claim in their brief that the trial court failed to hold an evidentiary hearing before dismissing the action, but we will not review that claim because it was not raised in the trial court.

Our examination of the record and briefs and our consideration of the arguments of the parties persuades us that the judgment of the trial court should be affirmed. The issues presented were resolved properly in the trial court's thoughtful and comprehensive memorandum of decision. See *Cuyler v. Board of Education*, 46 Conn. Sup. 486, A.2d (1998). Because that memorandum of decision fully addresses the arguments raised in this appeal, we adopt it as a proper statement of the facts and the applicable law on those issues. It would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained therein. See *East v. Labbe*, 54 Conn. App. 479, 480, 735 A.2d 370 (1999), *aff'd*, 252 Conn. 359, 746 A.2d 751 (2000).

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ Forty-two similarly situated teachers joined the named plaintiff, Mary Cuyler, as party plaintiffs.