

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

REBECCA MERRILL *v.* NRT NEW  
ENGLAND, INC., ET AL.  
(SC 18763)

Rogers, C. J., and Norcott, Palmer, Zarella, Eveleigh and Vertefeuille, Js.

Argued January 2—officially released January 29, 2013

*Thomas E. Crosby*, for the appellants (named defendant et al.).

*John R. Lambert*, for the appellee (plaintiff).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The defendants, NRT New England, Inc., NRT New England, LLC, Karen A. Godfrey and V. Holly Hoyt,<sup>1</sup> filed a motion to dismiss the action brought by the plaintiff, Rebecca Merrill, on the ground that the trial court lacked personal jurisdiction because of insufficient service of process. The trial court granted the motion and the plaintiff appealed from the judgment of dismissal to the Appellate Court. *Merrill v. NRT New England, Inc.*, 126 Conn. App. 314, 12 A.3d 575 (2011). The defendants claimed on appeal that the trial court lacked both personal jurisdiction and subject matter jurisdiction over the plaintiff's claims. *Id.*, 318. The Appellate Court concluded that the trial court had subject matter jurisdiction; *id.*, 322; and that the defendants had waived any claim that the trial court lacked personal jurisdiction. *Id.*, 323. Accordingly, the Appellate Court reversed the judgment of the trial court. *Id.* We then granted the defendants' petition for certification to appeal to this court, limited to the following issues: (1) "Did the Appellate Court properly determine that General Statutes §§ 52-72 and 52-46a did not deprive the [trial] court of subject matter jurisdiction?"; and (2) "Did the Appellate Court properly determine that the defendants waived any challenge to a lack of in personam jurisdiction?" *Merrill v. NRT New England, Inc.*, 300 Conn. 925, 925–26, 15 A.3d 629 (2011).

After examining the entire record on appeal and considering the briefs and oral arguments of the parties, we have determined that the appeal in this case should be dismissed on the ground that certification was improvidently granted.

**The appeal is dismissed.**

<sup>1</sup> Another party named as a defendant, Marilyn Noyes, did not appear in the trial court and is not involved in this appeal. References herein to the defendants are to NRT New England, Inc., NRT New England, LLC, Godfrey and Hoyt.

---