

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

DAVID A. FRIEDMAN v. CONNECTICUT BAR  
EXAMINING COMMITTEE  
(SC 17049)

Sullivan, C. J., and Borden, Norcott, Palmer and Vertefeuille, Js.

Argued May 17—officially released August 3, 2004

*Kenneth A. Votre*, with whom was *Keith Sturges*, for the appellant (petitioner).

*John B. Farley*, with whom were *Ralph W. Johnson III*, and *Dan E. LaBelle*, for the appellee (respondent).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM The petitioner, David A. Friedman, appeals, following our grant of certification, from the judgment of the Appellate Court affirming the judgment of the trial court denying his petition for admission to the Connecticut bar. *Friedman v. Connecticut Bar Examining Committee*, 77 Conn. App. 526, 824 A.2d 866 (2003). We granted the petition for certification to appeal limited to the following issue: “Whether the actions of the Connecticut bar examining committee denied the petitioner due process?” *Friedman v. Connecticut Bar Examining Committee*, 265 Conn. 909, 910, 831 A.2d 249 (2003).

After examining the entire record on appeal and considering the briefs and oral arguments of the parties, we have determined that the appeal in this case should be dismissed on the ground that certification was improvidently granted.

The appeal is dismissed.

---