
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.

CONNECTICUT HOUSING FINANCE AUTHORITY
v. HERBERT MUHAMMAD ET AL.
(AC 34602)

Lavine, Bear and Keller, Js.*

Argued January 14—officially released May 6, 2014

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of Hartford, Scholl, J. [summary judgment motion]; Robaina, J. [foreclosure judgment]; Wahla, J. [approval of committee sale, deed, report].)

J. Hanson Guest, with whom, on the brief, was *Megan L. Piltz*, for the appellant (named defendant).

Kevin J. Burns, for the appellee (plaintiff).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The defendant Herbert Muhammad¹ appeals from the judgment of foreclosure by sale, rendered by the trial court, in favor of the plaintiff, the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority. Shortly after this appeal was argued in the Appellate Court, the trial court, on February 3, 2014, issued an order approving the committee sale, deed and report. The defendant did not appeal from that order, and the time has expired for him to do so. On March 18, 2014, we issued an order, sua sponte, requiring the parties to file simultaneous supplemental briefs addressing the following question: “In light of the trial court’s February 3, 2014 order approving the committee sale/deed/report, and no appeal having been taken therefrom, why is the appeal in AC 34602 not moot?” The plaintiff filed its brief arguing that the appeal is moot because no relief could be afforded to the defendant. The defendant has not filed a supplemental brief or any other response to our order. We conclude that the appeal is moot and, thus, should be dismissed.

The appeal is dismissed.

* The listing of judges reflects their seniority status on this court as of the date of oral argument.

¹ The United States Secretary of Housing and Urban Development also is a defendant in this case and appears in this appeal as an appellee. For convenience, we refer only to Muhammad as the defendant.
