

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

TRAVELERS PROPERTY & CASUALTY CO. v. CHRISTIE—  
CONCURRENCE

BISHOP, J., concurring. I agree with the result reached by my colleagues and with the opinion's well reasoned analyses of the claims regarding prejudgment interest and the distribution of excess funds. I write separately, however, because I do not believe the record supports a finding that the trial court based its evidentiary rulings on a misinterpretation of the law, thereby entitling us to exercise plenary review. I believe that repeated statements by the trial court that "I can't allow you to do it now" or language in a similar vein reflect no more than colloquial speech and that these statements do not suggest that the court believed itself legally impotent to accede to the requests of the defendant Heather Christie. Having determined that the court did not rule as a matter of law, I would not accord plenary review to the defendant's evidentiary claims. Because I believe that the record fairly supports the conclusion that in refusing to balance the defendant's requests for the production of documents with the orderly conduct of the trial, the court failed to exercise its discretion properly, I concur with the result reached by my colleagues, although I take a different path.

---