

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

STATE v. ARTHUR H.—CONCURRENCE

ROGERS, C. J., concurring. I agree with the majority's conclusion that the record in this case supports a finding that the defendant, Arthur H., would pose a risk to public safety and that that finding is sufficient to support the trial court's order that the defendant register as a sex offender pursuant to General Statutes § 54-254 (a). I write separately because I am troubled by the portion of the majority opinion rejecting the state's claim that § 54-254 (a) creates a presumption that persons convicted of a felony committed for a sexual purpose pose a risk to the public safety. I would conclude that there is no need to reach that question because the record in the present case contains independent evidence to support a finding that the defendant posed a risk to the public safety, beyond the mere fact that the defendant committed a felony for a sexual purpose.

---