
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.

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 advance release version of an opinion and the latest version appearing in the Connecticut Law Journal and subsequently in the Connecticut Reports or Connecticut Appellate Reports, the latest version is to be considered authoritative.

The syllabus and procedural history accompanying the opinion as it appears 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.

HAYDUSKY'S APPEAL FROM PROBATE*
(AC 41905)

Bright, C. J., and Alvord and Cradle, Js.

Syllabus

The plaintiff appealed to the trial court from the Probate Court's denial of her claims for distribution of assets from the decedent's estate. The trial court denied the plaintiff's appeal and rendered judgment for the defendants, from which the plaintiff appealed to this court. *Held* that this court having concluded that the trial court's findings were not clearly erroneous, the court did not abuse its discretion, and the court's decision was legally correct, the court's judgment was affirmed.

Argued September 15—officially released December 15, 2020

Procedural History

Appeal from the decision of the Probate Court for the district of Milford-Orange denying the plaintiff's claims against the estate of her mother, brought to the Superior Court in the judicial district of Ansonia-Milford and tried to the court, *Hon. Arthur A. Hiller*, judge trial referee; judgment for the defendants, from which the plaintiff appealed to this court. *Affirmed*.

Marianne Haydusky, self-represented, the appellant (plaintiff).

John-Henry M. Steele, for the appellee (named defendant).

Susan King Shaw, for the appellees (defendant Karen Primavera et al.).

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Marianne Haydusky, appeals from the judgment of the trial court denying her claims on appeal from the decision of the Probate Court, which rejected her claims for distribution of assets from her mother's estate.¹ On appeal, the plaintiff claims that the court made clearly erroneous findings of fact, made erroneous evidentiary rulings, abused its discretion in a number of ways, including denying her request for a continuance of the trial, and misapplied the law. After carefully reviewing the briefs of the parties, in conjunction with their oral arguments and the record from the trial court, we conclude that the findings of the court are not clearly erroneous, that the court did not abuse its discretion as claimed by the plaintiff, and that the court's decision is correct in law.

The judgment is affirmed.

* In the Superior Court, the case was captioned *Marianne Haydusky v. Estate of Audrey L. Hayducky*. The judgment file, appeal form, and briefs bear the caption *Marianne Haydusky v. Estate of Audrey L. Hayducky*. The caption of the case that appears here conforms to the convention our appellate courts use for appeals from probate. See, e.g., *Garrett's Appeal from Probate*, 237 Conn. 233, 676 A.2d 394 (1996).

¹ The following individuals were served with the appeal: Betsy Davis, chief clerk of the Probate Court of the district of Milford-Orange; Joanne Hayducky, Karen Primavera, and Audrey M. Stella, daughters of the dece-

dent; and Kevin M. Casini, administrator.
