

Minutes of the Meeting
Rules Committee of the Superior Court
Monday, October 6, 2025

On October 6, 2025, the Rules Committee met using Microsoft Teams from 2:00 p.m. to 2:59 p.m.

Members in attendance were:

HON. WILLIAM H. BRIGHT, JR., CHAIR
HON. BARBARA AARON
HON. BARRY F. ARMATA
HON. KEVIN C. DOYLE
HON. ERNEST GREEN
HON. CHRISTOPHER A. H. GRIFFIN
HON. JENNIFER MACIEROWSKI
HON. JESSICA TORRES
HON. THOMAS J. WELCH

Also in attendance were Lori A. Petruzzelli, Counsel to the Rules Committee, and James T. O'Connor, Assistant Counsel to the Rules Committee.

1. The Committee unanimously approved the minutes of the meeting held on September 8, 2025.
2. The Committee considered a proposal from Attorney Zenas Zelotes that would require attorneys who use Artificial Intelligence (AI) programs to conduct legal research to append a certification to their pleadings and/or briefs that they have independently verified the accuracy of the citations therein (RC ID # [2023-011](#)).

The Committee also considered an informational memorandum from Attorney Kevin DiAdamo concerning Public Acts 2023, No. 23-16, and Artificial Intelligence technology generally (RC ID # 2023-014).

After discussion, the Committee tabled this matter until its November meeting for members to draft proposed language.

3. The Committee considered a proposal to amend the discovery rules in summary process matters (RC ID # [2024-013](#)).

Attorney Giovanna Shay from Greater Hartford Legal Aid was present and addressed the Committee.

After discussion, the Committee tabled this matter until a new proposal is submitted.

4. The Committee considered a proposal from Justice Andrew McDonald for a new rule to address the misgendering in Connecticut courts of individuals who are nonbinary or transgender (RC ID # [2024-016](#)).

Attorney Jenna Cutler from the Connecticut Bar Association (CBA) and Rebecca Schmitt from Superior Court Operations for the Judicial Branch were present and addressed the Committee on this matter.

After discussion, the Committee voted to send the subcommittee's proposals, as revised, to the Chief Administrative Judges of the Superior Court and to Superior Court Operations for comment.

5. The Committee also considered a proposal from Attorney Lisa J. Steele for adoption of rules concerning the use of names and pronouns for attorneys, parties, and witnesses (RC ID # [2024-020](#)).

After discussion, the Committee voted to table the matter until the Committee acts on RC ID # 2024-016.

6. The Committee considered a proposal from Chief Administrative Judge for Civil Matters, Barbara Bellis, to repeal Practice Book Section 16-12 and to add a new rule, Section 15-9, as amended by the CTLA, that provides a procedure where the trier of fact, whether judge or jury, may conduct a view of a place or thing involved in a case (RC ID # [2025-002](#)).

Judge Bellis was present and addressed the Committee on this matter.

After discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to submit to public hearing the proposal to repeal Practice Book Section 16-12 and to add a new Section 15-9, as amended and as set forth in Appendix A, attached to these minutes.

7. The Committee considered a proposal from Donna Boynton to amend Practice Book Section 7-19 to specify that a self-represented litigant may subpoena witnesses to depositions (RC ID # [2025-009](#)).

Judge Bellis was present and addressed the Committee on this matter.

After discussion, the Committee tabled this proposal to its November meeting and referred the matter to counsel to determine whether amending Section 7-19 is consistent with Practice Book Sections 13-26 to 13-28. Subsequently, the Committee referred the proposal by Judge Bellis to Judge Leo Diana, Chief Administrative Judge for Family Matters, for comment.

8. The Committee considered a proposal from Attorney James Sullivan for a new rule concerning notification to clients when a lawyer leaves a law firm (RC ID # [2025-011](#)).

After discussion, the Committee tabled this proposal and referred it for comment to the Connecticut Bar Association and the Bar Counsel for the Judicial Branch.

9. The Committee considered a proposal from Counsel to the Rules Committee to maintain the commentary to Practice Book Section 10-35 (RC ID # [2025-012](#)).

After discussion, the Committee voted to permanently include the commentary to Practice Book Section 10-35.

10. The Committee discussed having some of the meetings in person instead of virtually. Justice Bright will email the Committee with suggested dates for the in-person meetings (RC ID # [2025-MISC](#)).

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lori A. Petruzzelli

Lori A. Petruzzelli
Counsel to the Rules Committee

APPENDIX A

(100625)

(NEW) Sec. 15-9. View of Place or Thing Involved in Case

(a) When the judicial authority is of the opinion that a viewing by the trier of fact of the place or thing involved in the case will be helpful to the trier of fact in determining any material factual issue, it may in its discretion, at any time before the closing arguments, order that the trier of fact be conducted to such place or location of such thing. During the viewing, the jury, if any, must be kept together under the supervision of a proper officer appointed by the judicial authority. The judicial authority, whether trier of fact or not, and an official court reporter or court recording monitor must be present, and with the judicial authority's permission, any other person may be present. Counsel and self-represented parties may as a matter of right be present, but the right may be waived. The purpose of viewing shall be solely to permit visual observation by the trier of fact of the place or thing in question and to permit a brief description of the site or thing being viewed by the judicial authority or by any witness or witnesses as allowed by the judicial authority. Any proceedings at the location, including examination of witnesses, shall be at the discretion of the judicial authority. Neither the parties nor counsel nor the jurors, if any, while viewing the place or thing may engage in discussion of the significance or the implications of anything under observation or of any issue in the case.

(b) In exercising its discretion, the judicial authority should determine whether viewing the scene is necessary or important for the trier of fact to form a clearer understanding of the issues, whether the present conditions at the site are the same as those that existed on the date of the underlying incident, whether personal inspection is

fair to both parties and reasonably necessary to do justice, and whether there are reasonable alternatives available to inform the trier of fact of conditions existing at the time of the incident.

COMMENTARY: This new section, together with the repeal, of Section 16-12, View by Jury of Place or Thing involved in Case, provides a procedure where the trier of fact—whether by judge or jury—may view a place or thing involved in a case. Subsection (a) substantially mirrors Section 16-12, while replacing “jury” with “trier of fact” to make clear that this new section is not confined to jury trials.

Subsection (b) incorporates the standards set forth by the Supreme and Appellate Courts for determining whether a viewing should be permitted, including “whether a view is necessary or important in order to obtain a clearer understanding of the issues and to apply the evidence properly.” *Dickson v. Yale University*, 141 Conn. 250, 256, 105 A.2d 463, 465 (1954). Additionally, the judicial authority should consider whether personal inspection would be “fair to all parties concerned and is reasonably necessary to do justice between them.” *Greenberg v. Waterbury*, 117 Conn. 67, 74, 167 A. 83, 85 (1933); see *Mackin v. Mackin*, 186 Conn. 185, 190, 439 A.2d 1086 (1982). Finally, the court should determine whether there are reasonable alternatives available to apprise the trier of fact of conditions existing at the time of the incident. See *State v. Boutilier*, 144 Conn. App. 867, 873, 73 A.3d 880 (2013) (denying viewing when jury had testimony, diagrams, videos and photographs of crime scene).

Sec. 16-12. View by Jury of Place or Thing Involved in Case

[When the judicial authority is of the opinion that a viewing by the jury of the place or thing involved in the case will be helpful to the jury in determining any material factual issue, it may in its discretion, at any time before the closing arguments, order that the jury be conducted to such place or location of such thing. During the viewing, the jury must be kept together under the supervision of a proper officer appointed by the judicial authority. The judicial authority and an official court reporter or court recording monitor must be present, and, with the judicial authority's permission, any other person may be present. Counsel and self-represented parties may as a matter of right be present, but the right may be waived. The purpose of viewing shall be solely to permit visual observation by the jury of the place or thing in question and to permit a brief description of the site or thing being viewed by the judicial authority or by any witness or witnesses as allowed by the judicial authority. Any proceedings at the location, including examination of witnesses, shall be at the discretion of the judicial authority. Neither the parties nor counsel nor the jurors while viewing the place or thing may engage in discussion of the significance or the implications of anything under observation or of any issue in the case.]

COMMENTARY: The purpose of the repeal of this section is to facilitate a new Section 15-9, View of Place or Thing Involved in Case, that expands viewing of a place or thing to matters in which a judge is the trier of fact. Previously, viewing of a place or thing was limited to matters in which the jury was the trier of fact.