
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.

OCWEN FEDERAL BANK v. JEFFREY W.
NAVIN ET AL.
(AC 22167)

Schaller, Bishop and Peters, Js.

Argued June 3—officially released July 9, 2002

Defendant Patrick J. Berkerey's appeal from the Superior Court in the judicial district of New Haven, *Celotto, J.*

Per Curiam. The defendant Patrick J. Berkerey, a subsequent mortgagee, appeals from the judgment of foreclosure by sale rendered by the trial court. The defendant claims, inter alia, that the trial court abused its discretion in refusing to accept his appraiser's opinion concerning the fair market value of the property and in ordering a foreclosure by sale. On the basis of our thorough examination of the record, we conclude that the trial court acted within its discretion in determining the value of the property and in ordering foreclosure by sale. The defendant has offered no plausible argument supporting his claim that the trial court abused its discretion in any respect.

The judgment is affirmed.
