
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.

JUDY SANDVIG ET AL. v. A. DUBREUIL AND
SONS, INC., ET AL.
(SC 16781)

Sullivan, C. J., and Norcott, Katz, Vertefeuille and Zarella, Js.

Argued May 19—officially released July 13, 2004

Donald R. Beebe, for the appellants (plaintiffs).

Michael S. Burrell, for the appellee (named defendant).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiffs, Judy Sandvig and Karl Sandvig, appeal, following our grant of certification, from the judgment of the Appellate Court affirming the judgment of the trial court in favor of the named defendant, A. Dubreuil & Sons, Inc. *Sandvig v. A. Dubreuil & Sons, Inc.*, 68 Conn. App. 79, 789 A.2d 1012 (2002). At issue is whether the plaintiffs' negligence and contract claims against the named defendant are barred by the applicable statutes of limitations. See General Statutes § 52-584 (providing two year statute of limitations on negligence actions); General Statutes § 52-576 (providing six year statute of limitations on contract actions). We granted the plaintiffs' petition for certification to appeal limited to the following issue: "Did the Appellate Court properly conclude that: (1) with respect to the plaintiffs' negligence count, the relation back doctrine did not apply; (2) with respect to the plaintiffs'

contract count, the relation back doctrine did not apply; and (3) the statute of limitations applicable to the plaintiffs' causes of action was not tolled by the named defendant's bankruptcy proceedings?" *Sandvig v. A. Dubreuil & Sons, Inc.*, 260 Conn. 931, 799 A.2d 296 (2002).

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.
