

\*\*\*\*\*

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, with one exception. I do not agree with the majority's specific approval of the reasonable doubt instruction adopted by the New Jersey Supreme Court in *State v. Medina*, 147 N.J. 43, 61, 685 A.2d 1242 (1996), cert. denied, 520 U.S. 1190, 117 S. Ct. 1476, 137 L. Ed. 2d 688 (1997).

First, neither party brought that instruction to the attention of this court in the present case. Thus, the majority has approved that instruction without the parties having briefed it.

Second, and more important, I do not think that this court should, as a general matter and especially in the problematic area of the concept of reasonable doubt, be in the business of drafting specific instructions for trial courts. We do our appellate job better by doing what we ordinarily do, namely, reviewing instructions given by trial courts in the context of specific cases and deciding whether they meet the specific legal challenge presented by the parties. We should not start with language that was never employed, such as that adopted by the New Jersey Supreme Court, and then determine, in a litigation vacuum, that that language ought to be what judges say to jurors.

In this connection, I acknowledge that this court, in an opinion that I authored for the court, did draft specific instruction language in *State v. Ledbetter*, 275 Conn. 534, 579–80, 881 A.2d 290 (2005), cert. denied, U.S. , 126 S. Ct. 1798, 164 L. Ed. 2d 537 (2005). In hindsight, I think that this was unwise, and was proven to be so by the fact that, immediately upon the release of that opinion, we were required to issue a replacement page in that opinion amending the previously approved instruction. See *id.*

For example, consider the language of the New Jersey instruction that a reasonable doubt “is a doubt that a reasonable person hearing the same evidence would have.” *State v. Medina*, *supra*, 147 N.J. 61. I can conceive of the state contending that this language is too favorable to the defendant because it could give a juror who votes initially to acquit a basis to say to his or her fellow jurors: “I have this doubt. I am a reasonable person who heard the same evidence as you did. Therefore, according to the judge’s instructions, it is a reasonable doubt, and you all have to respect it.” End of deliberations.

My point is not that this will happen, or that such an argument by the state will prevail if presented. My point is simply that we ought to wait until some new language is used by a trial court and briefed by the parties on appeal, and then adjudicate its propriety in the context

of the case, rather than approve language without briefing, in a vacuum, and in advance of its use.

---