
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.

EVELEIGH, J., dissenting. As noted by the majority, “[i]n all material respects, the plaintiff’s complaint is indistinguishable from the complaint filed against the defendant in *Stotler v. Dept. of Transportation*, 313 Conn. , A.3d (2014), an opinion this court has also decided today. In *Stotler*, [this court] held that a claim identical to the one alleged in the present case was barred by sovereign immunity because it did not fall within the ambit of the defective highway statute. *Id.*, . The present case is controlled by our holding and analysis in *Stotler*.” Likewise, the reasoning of my dissent in the present case is identical to my dissent in *Stotler*. Rather than repeat the dissenting opinion, I reaffirm the analysis contained within my dissent in *Stotler* and apply the same reasoning to this case. Therefore, I respectfully dissent.