

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

## NEW SERVER

RIZZUTO *v.* DAVIDSON LADDERS, INC.—CONCURRENCE

PALMER, J., concurring. I join the majority opinion. I write separately simply to note that there is a way to achieve the result that the majority reaches without creating a new tort of intentional spoliation of evidence. That approach would be to extend our holding in *Beers v. Bayliner Marine Corp.*, 236 Conn. 769, 675 A.2d 829 (1996), to provide that a plaintiff may invoke the *Beers* adverse inference to satisfy his or her burden of production upon proof merely that the defendant had destroyed the evidence in bad faith, that is, with intent to deprive the plaintiff of his or her cause of action. Although I believe that such a modification of *Beers* would satisfy the concerns addressed by the majority, the plaintiff in the present action has not sought that remedy; indeed, the plaintiff has withdrawn his product liability claims, and, therefore, an extension of *Beers* in the manner suggested would not avail the plaintiff. In light of the procedural history of this case, and because I agree with the plaintiff that the currently available remedies for intentional, bad faith spoliation of evidence are inadequate, I join the majority opinion.

---