
The “officially released” date that appears near the beginning of this opinion is the date the opinion 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.

This opinion is subject to revisions and editorial changes, not of a substantive nature, and corrections of a technical nature prior to publication in the Connecticut Law Journal.

D'AURIA, J., concurring. Although I join the majority opinion in full, I agree in part with observations Justice Ecker makes in part III of his dissenting opinion concerning the identifiable victim-imminent harm exception to government immunity. Specifically, I am skeptical that the doctrinal validity of this exception can be based on whether a plaintiff “was compelled to be at the location where the injury occurred” (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Strycharz v. Cady*, 323 Conn. 548, 576, 148 A.3d 1011 (2016), overruled in part on other grounds by *Ventura v. East Haven*, 330 Conn. 613, 636–37, 637 n.12, 199 A.3d 1 (2019). The appropriate doctrinal underpinnings and limits of this exception would be useful to explore in a future case. I am satisfied, however, that the exception does not save the plaintiff’s cause of action from defeat in this case.
