
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.

ZARELLA, J., concurring. Although I agree with the conclusion of the majority, I do not agree, for all of the reasons expressed in my concurrence in *D'Eramo v. Smith*, 273 Conn. 610, 626, 872 A.2d 408 (2005) (*Zarella, J.*, concurring), that the legislative history of Public Acts 2004, No. 04-100 (P.A. 04-100), should be consulted to determine the legislative intent. Having concluded that P.A. 04-100 is a substantive provision that contains no language specifically directing that it be retroactively applied, the majority has no reason to consult extratextual evidence of the legislature's intent. See General Statutes § 1-2z;¹ see also General Statutes § 55-3.² Nevertheless, I fully agree with the majority's constitutional analysis and ultimate conclusion that we cannot construe a statute in such a way that would render it unconstitutional.

¹ General Statutes § 1-2z provides: "The meaning of a statute shall, in the first instance, be ascertained from the text of the statute itself and its relationship to other statutes. If, after examining such text and considering such relationship, the meaning of such text is plain and unambiguous and does not yield absurd or unworkable results, extratextual evidence of the meaning of the statute shall not be considered."

² General Statutes § 55-3 provides in relevant part: "No provision of the general statutes . . . which imposes any new obligation on any person . . . shall be construed to have a retrospective effect."
