
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 FOR PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS BY
DAN ROSS AS NEXT FRIEND ON BEHALF OF MICHAEL B. ROSS—
DISSENT

NORCOTT, LAVERY and DRANGINIS, Js., dissenting. We dissent from the order of the court dismissing the motions for a stay of execution, and we would grant, sua sponte, pursuant to the inherent supervisory powers over the administration of justice vested in this court; see *State v. Higgins*, 265 Conn. 35, 61 n.26, 826 A.2d 1126 (2003); a stay of execution. We disagree that an individual defendant may waive the benefit of any potential relief resulting from the disposition of the consolidated habeas corpus proceeding on behalf of all defendants sentenced to death in this jurisdiction ordered by this court in *State v. Reynolds*, 264 Conn. 1, 233, 836 A.2d 224 (2003), cert. denied, U.S. , 124 S. Ct. 1614, 158 L. Ed. 2d 254 (2004), addressing claims that Connecticut's death penalty system is administered in a racially discriminatory and arbitrary manner. We believe that a stay pending resolution of this review is mandated by our statutory responsibilities under General Statutes § 53a-46b (b) (1), and our institutional responsibilities to the criminal justice system. A full dissenting opinion will be published simultaneously with the full majority opinion.
