
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.

IN RE APPLICATION OF HARRY S. EBERHART
(SC 17003)

Borden, Katz, Palmer, Vertefeuille and Zarella, Js.

Argued December 4, 2003—officially released February 24, 2004

Jeffrey D. Brownstein, for the appellant (defendant).

Thomas J. Sansone, for the appellee (substitute plaintiff).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The defendant, Harry S. Eberhart, appeals from the judgment of the trial court dismissing his application for reinstatement to the bar of this state.¹ This was the defendant's second application for reinstatement, following his 1991 resignation from the bar, which was accompanied by a waiver of his right to apply for reinstatement. The defendant claims that the trial court improperly: (1) ignored certain provisions of the rules of practice; (2) applied the doctrines of collateral estoppel and res judicata; and (3) denied him due process of law.

Based on our examination of the record and briefs and our consideration of the arguments of the parties, we are persuaded that the judgment of the trial court should be affirmed. The issues were resolved properly in the trial court's concise and well reasoned memorandum of decision. *In re Application of Eberhart*, 48 Conn. Sup. 267, A.2d (2004). The memorandum of decision fully addresses all issues raised by the defendant in this appeal. Therefore, we adopt it as a proper statement of the issues and the applicable law concerning those issues. It would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained therein. See *Davis v. Freedom of Information Commission*, 259 Conn. 45, 55, 787 A.2d 530 (2002).

The judgment is affirmed.

¹The defendant appealed from the judgment of the trial court to the Appellate Court, and we transferred the appeal to this court pursuant to General Statutes § 51-199 (c) and Practice Book § 65-1.