
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.

ANTHONY E. BASILICATO *v.* STATE OF CONNECTICUT ET AL.
(AC 19975)

Lavery, C. J., and Spear and Mihalakos, Js.

Argued September 27—officially released October 24, 2000

Counsel

Anthony E. Basilicato, pro se, the appellant (plaintiff).

Robert F. Vacchelli, assistant attorney general, with whom, on the brief, was *Richard Blumenthal*, attorney general, for the appellees (defendants).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Anthony E. Basilicato, appeals from the judgment of the trial court dismissing his appeal from the decision of the defendant state board of firearms permit examiners (board), upholding the denial of his application for a pistol permit. In his appeal, the plaintiff raises thirteen issues, claiming that the court improperly failed to sustain his appeal, and that the board and the issuing authority, the West Haven chief of police, acted improperly in failing to grant him the permit.

Our examination of the record and briefs persuades us that the judgment of the court should be affirmed. The issues presented at trial were resolved properly in the court's thoughtful and comprehensive memorandum of decision. See *Basilicato v. State*, 46 Conn. Sup. 550, A.2d (1999). Because that decision fully addresses most of the arguments raised in this appeal, we adopt it as a proper statement of the facts and the applicable law on those issues. It would serve no useful purpose for us to repeat the discussion contained in the trial court's decision. See *East v. Labbe*, 54 Conn. App. 479–80, 735 A.2d 370 (1999), *aff'd*, 252 Conn. 359, 746 A.2d 751 (2000). Any issues not raised at the trial level have been reviewed by us, and we find them to be without merit.

The judgment is affirmed.
