

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

WILLIE DRAKEFORD *v.* COMMISSIONER OF  
CORRECTION  
(AC 27240)

Bishop, DiPentima and Pellegrino, Js.

Argued January 11—officially released March 20, 2007

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of  
Tolland, White, J.)

*Mary H. Trainer*, special public defender, for the  
appellant (petitioner).

*Frederick W. Fawcett*, supervisory assistant state's  
attorney, with whom, on the brief, were *Jonathan C.  
Benedict*, state's attorney, and *Gerard P. Eisenman*,  
senior assistant state's attorney, for the appellee  
(respondent).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The petitioner, Willie Drakeford, appeals following the habeas court's denial of his petition for certification to appeal from the judgment dismissing his amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus. We dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner was convicted, following a jury trial, of assault in the first degree as an accessory in violation of General Statutes §§ 53a-8 and 53a-59 (a) (5), attempt to commit assault in the first degree in violation of General Statutes §§ 53a-49 and 53a-59 (a) (5), and conspiracy to commit assault in the first degree in violation of General Statutes §§ 53a-48 and 53a-59 (a) (5). The petitioner received a total effective sentence of fifteen years incarceration. He then filed a direct appeal. Both this court and our Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of conviction. See *State v. Drakeford*, 63 Conn. App. 419, 777 A.2d 202 (2001), *aff'd*, 261 Conn. 420, 802 A.2d 844 (2002).

The petitioner subsequently filed an amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus in which he claimed that his trial counsel, Joseph Mirsky, had provided ineffective assistance. The habeas court rejected the petitioner's claim and then denied his petition for certification to appeal. The petitioner failed to file a timely appeal from the denial of his petition for certification to appeal, apparently because his habeas counsel suffered a stroke. Thereafter, in accordance with a stipulated agreement, the court restored the petitioner's right to appeal from the denial of his petition for certification to appeal.<sup>1</sup> On appeal, the petitioner claims that the court should have granted his petition for certification to appeal because Mirsky (1) inadequately investigated the petitioner's case, (2) inadequately cross-examined a witness and (3) improperly advised the petitioner not to testify in his defense.

The petitioner must demonstrate that the court abused its discretion in denying his petition for certification to appeal. We conclude that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the issues he has raised are debatable among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner or that the questions raised deserve encouragement to proceed further. See *Lozada v. Deeds*, 498 U.S. 430, 431-32, 111 S. Ct. 860, 112 L. Ed. 2d 956 (1991); *Simms v. Warden*, 230 Conn. 608, 616, 646 A.2d 126 (1994). Accordingly, the court did not abuse its discretion in denying the petition for certification to appeal.

The appeal is dismissed.

<sup>1</sup>The respondent, the commissioner of correction, provided us with a copy of the stipulated agreement and the court's judgment restoring the petitioner's right to appeal from the denial of his petition for certification to appeal after we inquired at oral argument as to the petitioner's delay in filing his appeal.