
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.

BORDEN, J., concurring. I agree with and join the majority opinion. I write separately solely to register my conclusion that the withdrawal of a negligence claim against a defendant that is supported by consideration, constitutes a “similar agreement” within the meaning of General Statutes § 52-572h (n), and therefore, triggers the apportionment of liability provisions of that statute. Simply stated, it is apparent to me that such an arrangement would fall comfortably within both the language and policies of the apportionment statute and, as such, there is no reason to exclude a withdrawal executed and filed in exchange for bargained for consideration—not necessarily financial—from the terms of the statute. The following hypothetical illustrates my point. Suppose a plaintiff withdraws his or her negligence action¹ against a defendant in exchange, say, for that defendant’s promise to take, or to refrain from taking, certain actions in the future, or in exchange, say, for that defendant’s promise to make a charitable contribution to a particular charity. Although no money changed hands between the parties, it is clear that the plaintiff’s withdrawal was predicated on a bargained for agreement from which the plaintiff derived a significant benefit. The fact that this benefit was not expressed in monetary terms should make no difference in determining the applicability of § 52-572h.

¹ I note that § 52-572h is a statute of general applicability that applies to all actions predicated on theories of negligence.