
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.

NELSON E. ARRIAGA *v.* COMMISSIONER OF
CORRECTION
(SC 18659)

Rogers, C. J., and Norcott, Palmer, Zarella, McLachlan, Eveleigh and
Harper, Js.

Argued January 9—officially released February 21, 2012

David J. Reich, special public defender, for the appellant (petitioner).

Sarah Hanna, assistant state's attorney, with whom, on the brief, were *Michael Dearington*, state's attorney, and *James R. Turcotte*, supervisory assistant state's attorney, for the appellee (respondent).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The habeas court dismissed the petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed by the petitioner, Nelson E. Arriaga, on the ground that it lacked jurisdiction over the matter because the petitioner was not in the custody of the respondent, the commissioner of correction (commissioner), when he filed the petition. Upon the habeas court's granting of his petition for certification to appeal, the petitioner appealed from the dismissal to the Appellate Court claiming that he was in the custody of the commissioner when he filed the petition because he was still on probation pursuant to his sentence for the challenged conviction. *Arriaga v. Commissioner of Correction*, 120 Conn. App. 258, 260, 990 A.2d 910 (2010). He further claimed that he had failed to allege in his petition that he was in custody because he had represented himself, and the Appellate Court should take judicial notice of his criminal records reflecting his custodial status. *Id.*, 261. The Appellate Court affirmed the judgment of the habeas court dismissing the petition. *Id.*, 265. This court then granted the petitioner's petition for certification to appeal to this court, limited to the following question: "Did the Appellate Court properly affirm the judgment of the [habeas] court in dismissing the petitioner's habeas corpus petition for lack of subject matter jurisdiction?"¹

After examining the entire 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.

¹ The certified question originally provided: "Did the Appellate Court properly dismiss the petitioner's habeas corpus petition for lack of subject matter jurisdiction"; *Arriaga v. Commissioner of Correction*, 297 Conn. 928, 998 A.2d 1195 (2010); but we rephrased the certified question in an amended order on the petition for certification dated January 4, 2011.