



2025 Edition

Oral Argument in Civil Matters

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

Table of Contents

Table 1: Practice Book § 11-18 - Oral Argument of Motions in Civil Matters	3
Section 1: Intent to Argue (Arguable Matters)	4
Section 2: Request for Oral Argument (Non-Arguable Matters)	11
Table 2: Unpublished Connecticut Decisions — Oral Argument	15

*Prepared by Connecticut Judicial Branch, Superior Court Operations,
Judge Support Services, Law Library Services Unit*

lawlibrarians@jud.ct.gov

These guides are provided with the understanding that they represent only a beginning to research. It is the responsibility of the person doing legal research to come to one's own conclusions about the authoritativeness, reliability, validity, and currency of any resource cited in this research guide.

View our other research guides at
<https://jud.ct.gov/lawlib/selfguides.htm>

This guide links to advance release opinions on the Connecticut Judicial Branch website and to case law hosted on Google Scholar and Harvard's Case Law Access Project. The online versions are for informational purposes only.

References to online legal research databases refer to in-library use of these databases. Remote access is not available.

[Connecticut Judicial Branch Website Policies and Disclaimers](https://www.jud.ct.gov/policies.htm)

<https://www.jud.ct.gov/policies.htm>

Table 1: Practice Book § 11-18 - Oral Argument of Motions in Civil Matters

Procedure in Civil Matters

Connecticut Practice Book (2025)

§ 11-18 — Oral Argument of Motions in Civil Matters

(a) Oral argument is at the discretion of the judicial authority except as to motions to dismiss, motions to strike, motions for summary judgment, motions for judgment of foreclosure, and motions for judgment on the report of an attorney trial referee and/or hearing on any objections thereto.

For those motions, oral argument shall be a matter of right, provided:

(1) the motion has been marked ready in accordance with the procedure that appears on the short calendar on which the motion appears, or

(2) a nonmoving party files and serves on all other parties pursuant to Sections 10-12 through 10-17, with proof of service endorsed thereon, a written notice stating the party's intention to argue the motion or present testimony. Such a notice shall be filed on or before the third day before the date of the short calendar date and shall contain (A) the name of the party filing the motion and (B) the date of the short calendar on which the matter appears.

(b) As to any motion for which oral argument is of right and as to any other motion for which the judicial authority grants or, in its own discretion, requires argument or testimony, the date for argument or testimony shall be set by the judge to whom the motion is assigned.

(c) If a case has been designated for argument as of right or by the judicial authority but a date for argument or testimony has not been set within thirty days of the date the motion was marked ready, the movant may reclaim the motion.

(d) Failure to appear and present argument on the date set by the judicial authority shall constitute a waiver of the right to argue unless the judicial authority orders otherwise.

(e) Notwithstanding the above, all motions to withdraw appearance, except those under Section 3-9 (b), and any other motions designated by the chief court administrator in the civil short calendar standing order shall be set down for oral argument.

(f) For those motions for which oral argument is not a matter of right, oral argument may be requested in accordance with the procedure that is printed on the short calendar on which the motion appears.

(P.B. 1978-1997, Sec. 211.) (Amended June 28, 1999, to take effect Jan. 1, 2000; amended June 21, 2004, to take effect Jan. 1, 2005; amended June 29, 2007, to take effect Jan. 1, 2008; amended June 20, 2011, to take effect Jan. 1, 2012.)

Section 1: Intent to Argue (Arguable Matters)

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

SCOPE:

- Bibliographic resources relating to oral argument of arguable matters, including related short calendar procedures.

DEFINITIONS:

- "Oral argument is at the discretion of the judicial authority except as to motions to dismiss, motions to strike, motions for summary judgment, motions for judgment of foreclosure, and motions for judgment on the report of an attorney trial referee and/or hearing on any objections thereto. For those motions, oral argument shall be a matter of right, provided..." Conn. Practice Book [§ 11-18](#)(a) (2025).
- "[E]ven though Practice Book sec. 11-18 grants ... oral argument as a matter of right, it is not automatic but must be claimed for argument as provided [by the rule]." [Wasilewski v. Commissioner of Transportation](#), 152 Conn. App. 560, 569, 99 A.3d 1181 (2014).

COURT RULES:

Amendments to the Practice Book (Court Rules) are published in the [Connecticut Law Journal](#) and posted [online](#).

- Connecticut Practice Book (2025)
 - [§ 11-18](#). Oral Argument of Motions in Civil Matters

STANDING ORDERS:

- [Superior Court Standing Orders](#)
 - [Civil Short Calendar Standing Order](#)
 - [Foreclosure Short Calendar](#)

E-FILING:

- [Mark Short Calendar Matters](#) (Instructions and Reference Guides)
- [Quick Reference Guide: Short Calendar and the Marking Process](#)

SHORT CALENDAR INFORMATION:

- [Short Calendars](#) (<http://civilinquiry.jud.ct.gov/ShortCalMenu.aspx>)
 - [Short Calendar Notices](#)

FORMS:

Official Judicial Branch forms are frequently updated. Please visit the [Official Court Webforms page](#) for the current forms.

- [JD-CL-6](#). Short Calendar List, Claim/Reclaim.
- 2 Connecticut Practice Series, *Connecticut Civil Practice Forms*, 5th ed., by Joel M. Kaye & Wayne D. Effron, Thomson West, 2025 (also available on Westlaw).
 - § 19:5 Request for Oral Argument
 - § 10:16 Motion to dismiss
 - § 10:18 Motion to strike
 - § 24:15 Motion for summary judgment

- *Civil Litigation: Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, & Rhode Island*, by Kimberly A. Peterson, Prentice Hall, 1999.
 - Example 7-1. Connecticut, Notice of Intent to Argue, p. 147.
- *Civil Litigation in Connecticut: Anatomy of a Lawsuit*, by Kimberly A. Peterson, Prentice Hall, 1998.
 - Chapter 8. Pleadings: An Overview
 - Example 1, Notice of Intent to Argue, p. 86.
- *1 Dupont on Connecticut Civil Practice*, by Ralph P. Dupont, 2024-2025 ed., LexisNexis.
 - F.11-18. Notice of Intent to Argue

CASES:

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

- [Bradley v. Yovino](#), 218 Conn. App. 1, 24-25, 291 A.3d 133, 149-150 (2023). "The court adjudicated the motion for summary judgment without providing the parties with an opportunity to mark the motion according to the schedule set forth in the short calendar on which the motion appeared. Bradley also had a right to oral argument on the motion pursuant to Practice Book § 11-18 (a) and this right was improperly denied. To prevail on his claim of procedural error, however, Bradley must also demonstrate that the court's erroneous actions likely affected the result. Bradley has not demonstrated that the court's failure to provide oral argument on the motion likely affected the court's decision rendering summary judgment as to his breach of contract claim against the university. Accordingly, we cannot conclude that the court committed reversible error.
- [Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC v. Frimel](#), 192 Conn. App. 786, 795-796, 218 A.3d 717, 722 (2019). "Additionally, the court granted the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment in the absence of oral argument on the motion. As stated previously in this opinion, at the hearing on July 24, 2017, the court indicated that it would consider the matter on or after August 18, 2017, and that if the defendant had not filed anything by that date, it would grant the plaintiff's motion. In response to an inquiry by counsel for the plaintiff, the court stated that the defendant could file a request for oral argument by August 18, 2017; otherwise, the court would consider the motion on the papers. Habib filed an appearance for the defendant on August 18, 2017, and an objection to the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on August 21, 2017. The objection indicated that oral argument was requested. Notwithstanding these filings, on August 29, 2017, the court granted the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment without hearing oral argument on the merits of the plaintiff's motion.

"Practice Book § 11-18 provides in relevant part: '(a) Oral argument is at the discretion of the judicial authority except as to ... motions for summary judgment ... and/or hearing on any objections thereto. For those motions, oral argument shall be a matter of right, provided: (1) the motion has been marked ready in accordance with the procedure that appears on the

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

short calendar on which the motion appears, or (2) a nonmoving party files and serves on all other parties ... a written notice stating the party's intention to argue the motion or present testimony. Such a notice shall be filed on or before the third day before the date of the short calendar date' 'Parties are entitled to argue a motion for summary judgment as of right.' *Singhaviroj v. Board of Education*, 124 Conn. App. 228, 236, 4 A.3d 851 (2010)." (p. 795-796)

- [Chase Home Finance, LLC v. Scroggin](#), 194 Conn. App. 843, 857-858, 222 A.3d 1025, 1033-1034 (2019). "Applying *Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC*, to the present case, we conclude that the trial court erred by granting the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment without hearing oral argument on the motion. We have carefully reviewed the approximately two page transcript from the short calendar proceeding and conclude that the opportunity for oral argument required by Practice Book § 11-18 (a) was not provided. That is, upon confirming that the defendant had not filed a written response to the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, the court did not inquire whether the defendant's counsel wanted to be heard, namely, to argue whether the plaintiff had met its initial burden. Instead, the court immediately granted the motion 'absent opposition.'"
- [Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Owen](#), 174 Conn. App. 102, 111, 165 A.3d 275, 280 (2017). "It is also notable that in the defendants' motion to open the judgment of strict foreclosure, the defendants' counsel only requested oral argument and specifically indicated that testimony was not required. See *USA Bank v. Schulz*, 143 Conn. App. 412, 419, 70 A.3d 164 (2013) ('the defendant has no basis for claiming an abuse of discretion by the trial court in denying him relief that he could readily have sought, had he wished to, at a time when he was represented by competent counsel'). Perhaps another judge might have ordered an evidentiary hearing under the circumstances; however, we are unwilling to conclude that the failure to do so was an abuse of discretion."
- [Wasilewski v. Commissioner of Transportation](#), 152 Conn. App. 560, 569-570, 99 A.3d 1181 (2014). "[E]ven though Practice Book § 11-18 grants ... oral argument as a matter of right, it is not automatic but must be claimed for argument as provided [by the rule].' (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Curry v. Allan S. Goodman, Inc.*, 95 Conn. App. 147, 152, 895 A.2d 266 (2006). The plaintiff further argues that he could not claim the motion for oral argument as a matter of right because it was not scheduled for short calendar after he filed his objection to the motion to dismiss. We agree with the plaintiff that he was entitled to oral argument on the motion to dismiss as a matter of right under Practice Book § 11-18. We nonetheless deem the court's decision to grant the motion without hearing oral argument on it to be harmless error. 'In order to constitute reversible error ... the ruling must be both erroneous and harmful.... The burden of proving harmful error rests on the party asserting it ... and the ultimate question is whether the

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

erroneous action would likely affect the result.’ (Citations omitted.) *Manning v. Michael*, 188 Conn. 607, 611, 452 A.2d 1157 (1982). The plaintiff contends that he ‘believes that the court would have benefitted in making its decision if it had heard oral argument on the [m]otion to [d]ismiss.’ Given the extent of the patent deficiencies in the notice, however, and the plenary standard of review that we apply in this case, the court’s failure to hold oral argument on the motion before granting it was harmless error.”

- [People's United Bank v. Bok](#), 143 Conn. App. 263, 267, n. 5, 70 A.3d 1074, 1077 (2013). “The plaintiff also argues that because the defendants failed to appear at the hearing on its motion for judgment, the defendants waived their right to challenge the default and judgment of strict foreclosure on appeal. While the defendants may have waived their right to argue their objection before the court by failing to appear at the hearing; see Practice Book § 11-18(d); to the extent that the plaintiff claims that the defendants abandoned the merits of their claim for purposes of appeal, we reject the plaintiff’s argument.”
- [Cornelius v. Rosario](#), 138 Conn. App. 1, 20, 51 A. 3d 1144 (2012). “Section 11-18 sets forth the proper procedure for, inter alia, requesting oral argument or testimony with respect to various motions in civil matters. This section does not state or indicate that oral testimony is permitted or required on a motion for summary judgment; rather, it provides the procedure for requesting oral argument or testimony on motions on which either or both is appropriate.”
- [Town of Stratford v. Castater](#), 136 Conn. App. 535, 545, 46 A. 3d 953 (2012). “‘Whether to allow counsel fees and in what amount calls for the exercise of judicial discretion.... Generally, when the exercise of the court’s discretion depends on issues of fact which are disputed, due process requires that a trial-like hearing be held, in which an opportunity is provided to present evidence and to cross-examine adverse witnesses.’ (Citation omitted; internal quotation marks omitted.) *Esposito v. Esposito*, 71 Conn. App. 744, 747, 804 A.2d 846 (2002).”

“Here, the defendant requested a hearing on his motion for attorney’s fees for the first time in his motion for reconsideration. In the motion for reconsideration, the defendant’s counsel specifically stated that ‘[o]n Thursday, March 31, 2011, counsel marked the motion “take on the papers”: no objection had been made.’ It is well established that ‘[t]he knowledge and admissions of an attorney are imputed to his client.’ *Lafayette Bank & Trust Co. v. Aetna Casualty & Surety Co.*, 177 Conn. 137, 140, 411 A.2d 937 (1979). Thus, even assuming that the defendant had a right to a hearing on his motion for attorney’s fees, he waived that right when his counsel marked the motion for attorney’s fees ‘take on the papers’; the later request for a hearing on the

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

motion for reconsideration, therefore, was ineffective.” (p. 545-546)

- [Marut v. Indymac Bank](#), 132 Conn. App. 763, 771-772, 34 A.3d 439 (2012). “The plaintiff relies on Practice Book § 11-18 (a), which states that a motion for summary judgment is subject to oral argument as of right. The court, however, is not responsible for absenteeism in the courts by either the parties or their counsel. The court afforded the plaintiff the opportunity for oral argument on December 6, 2010, in accordance with Practice Book § 11-18 (a), but the plaintiff did not appear after his motion for a continuance was denied. As the court noted in its January 5, 2011 order, Practice Book § 11-18 (d) also provides in relevant part: ‘Failure to appear and present argument on the date set by the judicial authority shall constitute a waiver of the right to argue unless the judicial authority orders otherwise.’ Therefore, the court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to open.”
- [Curry v. Allan S. Goodman, Inc.](#), 286 Conn. 390, 400, 944 A.2d 925 (2008). “The Appellate Court did not reach the merits of the appeal, but concluded that the trial court had abused its discretion in granting the defendant's motion for summary judgment solely on the basis of the defendant's pleadings and ignoring the parties' right to oral argument under Practice Book § 11-18. *Curry v. Allan S. Goodman, Inc.*, 95 Conn. App. 147, 152-53, 895 A.2d 266 (2006). It therefore reversed the judgment and remanded the case to the trial court with direction to hold a hearing and to allow oral argument on the defendant's motion for summary judgment.”
- [Vertex v. Waterbury](#), 278 Conn. 557, 568, 898 A.2d 178 (2006). “First, as noted previously herein, the trial court in its memorandum of decision acknowledged that no motion to strike or motion for summary judgment had been filed. The pretrial briefs that led to the dismissal of two counts of the complaint were filed on the trial judge's order and not at the initiative of either party. Second, the record does not demonstrate that the plaintiff knowingly waived the applicable procedures under the rules of practice for dispositive motions. . . Finally, the record does not reveal that the plaintiff had a fair opportunity to respond to the potential dismissal of claims because it lacked notice that the trial court intended to use the parties' pretrial briefs to rule on the legal sufficiency of its claims.”
- [Haggerty v. Williams](#), 84 Conn. App. 675, 685, 855 A.2d 264 (2004). “The defendant's second argument fails because the defendant did in fact present oral argument to the court on her succeeding motion to open. Although the defendant argues that she should have been able to argue before Judge Celotto instead of Judge DeMayo, there is no such rule in Connecticut. The defendant had her day in court to argue her motion to open and, accordingly, that claim must fail.”
- [Bojila v. Shramko](#), 80 Conn. App. 508, 518, 758 A.2d 906

(2003). "The substitute plaintiff argues in his reply brief that oral argument was available as a matter of right without meeting the procedure set forth in Practice Book § 11-18(a). That simply is inaccurate."

- [Davis v. Westport](#), 61 Conn. App. 834, 839-840, 767 A.2d 1237 (2001). "Therefore, we concluded that 'even if [Practice Book (1999) § 19-16] grants . . . oral argument as of right, it is not automatic but must be claimed for argument as provided in [Practice Book (1999) § 11-18]. . . .Aside from the plain meaning of the words of those sections, which do not grant oral argument as of right . . . judicial economy and practicality require a common sense reading of both sections.' Paulus v. LaSala, [56 Conn. App. 139, 146, 742 A.2d 379 (1999), cert. denied, 252 Conn. 928, 746 A.2d 789 (2000)]."

WEST KEY NUMBERS:

TEXTS & TREATISES:

Each of our law libraries own the Connecticut treatises cited. You can [contact](#) us or visit our [catalog](#) to determine which of our law libraries own the other treatises cited or to search for more treatises.

References to online databases refer to in-library use of these databases. Remote access is not available.

- Trial # 12. Short-cause calendars.
- 1 *Dupont on Connecticut Civil Practice*, by Ralph P. Dupont, 2024-2025 ed., LexisNexis.
 - Chapter 11. Motions, requests, [applications] orders of notice and short calendar
 - § 11-18.1 Requesting oral argument; testimony
- *LexisNexis Practice Guide: Connecticut Civil Pretrial Practice*, by Margaret P. Mason, 2024 ed., LexisNexis.
 - § 11.06[4][c] Not all motions are assigned for oral argument or hearing dates
 - § 11.06[5][e] Available markings
 - § 11.06[5][g] Motions listed as arguable
 - § 11.07[1][b] Motions for which oral argument is as of right
 - § 11.07[1][c] Date for hearing set by judge to whom motion is assigned
 - § 11.12[1] Oral argument is at court's discretion except for certain motions
- *Civil Litigation in Connecticut: Anatomy of a Lawsuit*, Kimberly A. Peterson, Prentice Hall, 1998.
 - Chapter 8. Pleadings: An Overview
 - VI. How pleadings are decided: Short Calendar
 - E. When an opposing party wants oral argument
- *Civil Litigation: Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, & Rhode Island*, Kimberly A. Peterson, Prentice Hall, 1999.
 - Chapter 7. The pretrial stage: motions and objections
 - State summaries
 - Motion practice in Connecticut
 - 1. Motions and pleadings
 - D. Oral arguments as a right: Pbs 11-18
 - E. When oral argument is not requested
 - F. When an opposing party wants oral argument

- G. Deadline to file Notice of Intent to Argue
- 1 Connecticut Practice Series, *Connecticut Superior Court Civil Rules*, by Wesley W. Horton et al., 2024-2025 ed., Thomson West (also available on Westlaw).
 - Chapter 11. Motions, requests, orders of notice, and short calendar
 - § 11-18 and Authors' comments
- 18 Connecticut Practice Series, *Summary Judgment & Related Termination Motions*, by Erin Carlson, 2025 ed., Thomson West (also available on Westlaw).
 - Chapter 3. Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication
 - II. Key supporting citations
 - § 3:39. Procedural considerations—Oral argument
 - V. Key opposition citations
 - § 3:95. Procedural considerations—Oral argument
- *Fundamentals of Litigation Practice*, by David Herr & Roger Haydock, 2025 ed., Thomson West (also available on Westlaw).
 - Chapter 27. Effective Presentation of Motions
- *Brief Writing & Oral Argument*, 9th ed., by Edward D. Re & Joseph R. Re, Oceana, 2005.
 - Part Four: Oral Argument
 - IX. Preparation for Oral Argument
 - X. Presentation of Oral Argument
 - XI. Considerations after Oral Argument
- *The Winning Oral Argument: enduring principles with supporting comments from literature*, by Bryan A. Garner, Thomson West, 2009.
- *Persuasive Written and Oral Advocacy in Trial and Appellate Courts*, 2nd ed., by Michael R. Fontham, Michael Vitiello, and David W. Miller, Wolters Kluwer, 2007.
 - Part II. Oral Argument
 - Preparing for oral argument
 - Presenting the oral argument
 - Part IV. Handling Appeals and Writs
 - Preparing appellate briefs and oral argument

Section 2: Request for Oral Argument (Non-Arguable Matters)

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

SCOPE:

- Bibliographic resources relating to requests to argue motions for which oral argument is not a matter of right, including related short calendar procedures.

DEFINITIONS:

- “For those motions for which oral argument is not a matter of right, oral argument may be requested in accordance with the procedure that is printed on the short calendar on which the motion appears.” Conn. Practice Book [§ 11-18](#)(f) (2025).

COURT RULES:

Amendments to the Practice Book (Court Rules) are published in the [Connecticut Law Journal](#) and posted [online](#).

- Connecticut Practice Book (2025)
[§ 11-18](#). Oral Argument of Motions in Civil Matters

FORMS:

Official Judicial Branch forms are frequently updated. Please visit the [Official Court Webforms page](#) for the current forms.

- [JD-CV-128](#). Request For Argument, Non-Arguable Civil Short Calendar Matter
- [JD-CL-6](#). Short Calendar List, Claim/Reclaim

SHORT CALENDAR INFORMATION:

- [Short Calendars](#)
 - [Short Calendar Notices](#)

E-FILING:

- [Mark Short Calendar Matters](#) (Instructions and Reference Guides)
- [Quick Reference Guide: Short Calendar and the Marking Process](#)

STANDING ORDERS:

- [Superior Court Standing Orders](#)
 - [Civil Short Calendar Standing Order](#)
 - [Family Short Calendar Standing Order](#)

CASES:

- [Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Tarzia](#), 186 Conn. App. 800, 201 A.3d. 501 (2019). “Although the defendant argues that he was denied a proper hearing, we have found no indication in the record before us that the defendant actually requested one. In the defendant's motion, he simply entreated the court to open and vacate the judgment of strict foreclosure for the reasons he provided therein. Absent from the record is a request that he be given an evidentiary hearing or oral argument on it.”^[6] (p. 807)

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

"To the extent the defendant is arguing that he was entitled to oral argument, a motion to open is not a motion for which oral argument is permitted as of right. See Practice Book § 11-18 (a); [Valenzisi v. Connecticut Education Assn.](#), 150 Conn. App. 47, 50 n.2, 90 A.3d 324 (2014)." (FN6)

- [Krahel v. Czoch](#), 186 Conn. App. 22, 38 n.11, 198 A.3d 103 (2018). "To the extent that the defendant argues that he was deprived of his right to be heard because the court failed to grant a hearing on the plaintiff's motion to effectuate the court's judgment, we reject this claim. Oral argument on such motions is not a matter of right. The record in the present case reflects that the defendant (1) filed an objection and, thus, his position was before the court, (2) did not request oral argument pursuant to Practice Book § 11-18 (f), (3) has not claimed and cannot demonstrate that the motion before the court was arguable as of right pursuant to subsection (a) of § 11-18, and (4) did not seek reargument after the court's ruling. His claim, therefore, is unavailing."
- [Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Henderson](#), 175 Conn. App. 474, 491, 167 A.3d 1065, 1075 (2017). "A decision on a motion for a continuance is reviewed for an abuse of discretion by the trial court, but the defendant makes no claim that this denial was an abuse of discretion; she claims only that she was denied an opportunity to present oral argument on this motion. The defendant has failed to provide any record of a request on her part for oral argument of her motion, and a motion for a continuance is not one of the civil motions that require oral argument pursuant to Practice Book § 11-18 (a). As a result, the court had the discretion to rule on her motion for a continuance without providing for oral argument."

"The defendant had no right to an evidentiary hearing on her motion to reargue, and the court had the discretion to deny it without a hearing. Practice Book § 11-12 (c) provides: 'The motion to reargue shall be considered by the judge who rendered the decision or order. Such judge shall decide, without a hearing, whether the motion to reargue should be granted. If the judge grants the motion, the judge shall schedule the matter for hearing on the relief requested.'" (p. 492-493)

- [D'Amato v. Hart-D'Amato](#), 169 Conn. App. 669, 675-676, 152 A. 3d 546 (2016). "Pursuant to Practice Book § 11-18(a), however, whether to hear oral argument on motions in civil matters is a matter within the discretion of the court, except in limited circumstances, not relevant here, in which argument is a matter of right. Section 11-18(a) provides in relevant part: 'Oral argument is at the discretion of the judicial authority except as to motions to dismiss, motions to strike, motions for summary judgment, motions for judgment of foreclosure, and motions for judgment on the report of an attorney trial referee and/or hearing on any objections thereto....' We review the claim of error in not hearing oral argument under an abuse of

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

discretion standard. See *Brochard v. Brochard*, 165 Conn. App. 626, 638, 140 A.3d 254 (2016). It is clear, then, that the defendant was not entitled to oral argument as of right on her motion for a continuance, her 'motion to open and set aside judgment and for new trial,' her motion to reargue/reconsideration, and her motion for clarification. The trial court's decisions not to hold evidentiary hearings with respect to these motions were, by the rules of practice and case authority, within its discretion."

- [Marcus v. Cassara](#), 142 Conn. App. 352, 357, 66 A.3d 894 (2013). "It is unfair to the court to leave it with the impression that counsel is in agreement with the court's preference to decide the motion on the papers and then argue on appeal that the court abused its discretion by failing to schedule an evidentiary hearing. See *Stratford v. Castater*, 136 Conn. App. 535, 545-46, 46 A.3d 953 (2012). Accordingly, we decline to review the merits of the defendant's claim."
- [Town of Stratford v. Castater](#), 136 Conn. App. 535, 546, 46 A.3d 953 (2012). "The defendant cites no authority, nor are we aware of any, in support of his argument that the trial court was obligated to hold a hearing on the motion for reconsideration itself. '[A] motion to reargue ... is not to be used as an opportunity to have a second bite of the apple....' (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Opoku v. Grant*, 63 Conn. App. 686, 692-93, 778 A.2d 981 (2001)."
- [Haggerty v. Williams](#), 84 Conn. App. 675, 685, 855 A.2d 264 (2004). "The defendant's second argument fails because the defendant did in fact present oral argument to the court on her succeeding motion to open. Although the defendant argues that she should have been able to argue before Judge Celotto instead of Judge DeMayo, there is no such rule in Connecticut. The defendant had her day in court to argue her motion to open and, accordingly, that claim must fail."
- [Dietzel v. Redding](#), 60 Conn. App. 153, 166, 758 A.2d 906 (2000). "We note, parenthetically, that the Oppenheims had requested oral argument on the motion to intervene. Pursuant to Practice Book § 11-18, however, oral argument is at the discretion of the trial court for that type of motion, and, therefore, the court was not obligated to provide them with an opportunity for oral argument."
- Trial # 12. Short-cause calendars.
- 1 *Dupont on Connecticut Civil Practice*, by Ralph P. Dupont, 2024-2025 ed., LexisNexis.
 - Chapter 11. Motions, requests, [applications] orders of notice and short calendar
 - § 11-18.1 Requesting oral argument; testimony
- *LexisNexis Practice Guide: Connecticut Civil Pretrial Practice*, by Margaret P. Mason, 2024 ed., LexisNexis.

**WEST KEY
NUMBERS:
TEXTS &
TREATISES:**

Each of our law libraries own the Connecticut treatises cited. You can [contact](#) us or visit our [catalog](#) to determine which of our law libraries own the other treatises cited or to search for more treatises.

References to online databases refer to in-library use of these databases. Remote access is not available.

- § 11.06[5][e] Available markings
 - § 11.07[1][c] Date for hearing set by judge to whom motion is assigned
 - § 11.12[1] Oral argument is at court's discretion except for certain motions
 - § 11.12[4] Party may request hearing
 - § 11.12[5] Judge sets date for hearing
 - § 11.12[6] Either party may reclaim motion if marked off previously
 - § 11.12[7] Failure to appear at hearing
- *Civil Litigation: Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, & Rhode Island*, by Kimberly A. Peterson, Prentice Hall, 1999.
 - Chapter 7. The pretrial stage: motions and objections
 - State summaries
 - Motion practice in Connecticut
 - 1. Motions and pleadings
 - H. Oral argument for other motions or objections
- *Civil Litigation in Connecticut: Anatomy of a Lawsuit*, by Kimberly A. Peterson, Prentice Hall, 1998.
 - Chapter 8. Pleadings: An Overview
 - VI. How pleadings are decided: Short Calendar
 - E. When an opposing party wants oral argument
- 1 Connecticut Practice Series, *Connecticut Superior Court Civil Rules*, by Wesley W. Horton et al., 2024-2025 ed., Thomson West (also available on Westlaw).
 - Chapter 11. Motions, requests, orders of notice, and short calendar
 - § 11-18 and Authors' comments
- *Brief Writing & Oral Argument*, 9th ed., Edward D. Re & Joseph R. Re, Oceana, 2005.
 - Part Four: Oral Argument
 - IX. Preparation for Oral Argument
 - X. Presentation of Oral Argument
 - XI. Considerations after Oral Argument
- *The Winning Oral Argument: enduring principles with supporting comments from literature*, by Bryan A. Garner, Thomson West, 2009.
- *Persuasive Written and Oral Advocacy in Trial and Appellate Courts*, 2nd ed., by Michael R. Fontham, Michael Vitiello, and David W. Miller, Wolters Kluwer, 2007.
 - Part II. Oral Argument
 - Preparing for oral argument
 - Presenting the oral argument
 - Part IV. Handling Appeals and Writs
 - Preparing appellate briefs and oral argument

Table 2: Unpublished Connecticut Decisions — Oral Argument

Unpublished Connecticut Decisions — Oral Argument	
Marking Motion "Ready" Versus "Take Papers"	<u>Discover Bank v. Freedman</u> , Superior Court, Judicial District of Litchfield at Litchfield, No. LLI-CV-12-6007025S (April 23, 2013) (2013 WL 1943887) (2013 Conn. Super. LEXIS 880). "Practice Book § 11-18(a)(1) provides that oral argument is a matter of right on a motion for summary judgment, provided that the motion was marked 'ready.' In the present case, the motion for summary judgment was marked 'take papers.' Therefore, no oral argument was conducted and this court's decision is based upon the arguments and evidence set forth in the motion for summary judgment." [Footnote 1]
Improperly Filed Motion	<u>Richard Patterson et al. v. Mine Safety Appliances Company et al.</u> , Superior Court, Judicial District of Hartford, Complex Litigation Docket at Hartford, No. HDD-X04-CV-04-4034666-S (May 7, 2008) (45 Conn. L. Rptr. 462, 463) (2008 WL 2169400) (2008 Conn. Super. LEXIS 1141). "The plaintiffs' motion to strike is not addressed to a pleading. Accordingly, it is denied. Under these circumstances, where the plaintiffs improperly filed a motion to strike, they were not entitled to oral argument as of right. See Practice Book § 11-18(a)."
Nonappearance by Defense Counsel	<u>Nadeau v. Tracy</u> , Superior Court, Judicial District of New Haven at Meriden, No. CV 02-0282226S (Dec. 2, 2003) (2003 WL 22905182) (2003 Conn. Super. LEXIS 3242). "Pursuant to Practice Book § 11-18(d), the court treated nonappearance by defense counsel at the hearing as a waiver of the defendants' right to argue, heard argument from plaintiff, and then denied the motion to strike for the reason stated below."
Nonappearance by Both Counsel	<u>Nair v. Belcher</u> , Superior Court, Judicial District of Waterbury, No. CV 01 0163122 (Dec. 10, 2001) (2001 WL 1681964) (2001 Conn. Super. LEXIS 3556). "Further, in light of the failure of counsel for the plaintiff and counsel for the defendants (except for Leask) to appear for this matter on the date assigned, the court hereby enters a default against the defendants (except for Leask) and a nonsuit against the plaintiffs, neither of which may be opened except upon the filing of a proper motion explaining on oath the reason for the failure to appear for argument as ordered, along with any required fee. Such motion shall only be considered by the court upon attendance of the moving party at a scheduled oral argument, so claimed in a proper manner by the moving party." [Decision corrected in <u>Nair v. Belcher</u> , Superior Court, Judicial District of Waterbury, No. CV 01-0163122 (Dec. 20, 2001) (2001 WL

Notice of Intent to Argue Without Explanation of Why Argument Is Necessary (For Class of Motions Not as of Right)	<u>Matos v. B-Right Trucking Co.</u> , Superior Court, Judicial District of Fairfield at Bridgeport, No. CV 94310065S (January 9, 1996) (15 Conn. L. Rptr. 650, 650) (1996 WL 38247) (1996 Conn. Super. LEXIS 86). "The motion to reargue is denied. Under Practice Book § 211(A) [now 11-18], as amended effective October 1, 1995, oral argument on such motions is within the discretion of the court. When the defendant filed its Notice of Intent to Argue, it did not explain why oral argument was necessary nor did it explain why the defendant should prevail. Section 211 was amended to facilitate the resolution of short calendar motions. Clearly, the two motions decided by the court were ones which could be decided without oral argument. Whenever a litigant files a motion of the class for which oral argument does not exist as of right, the opposing party must do something more than merely file a notice of intent to argue. Otherwise, the amendment to § 211 will have had no effect whatsoever."
Motion to Reargue	<u>Faile v. Zarich</u> , Superior Court, Judicial District of Hartford, Complex Litigation Docket at Hartford, No. HHD X04 CV-06-5015994 S (Sep. 10, 2009) (2009 WL 3285986) (2009 Conn. Super. LEXIS 2406). "As discussed above, the defendants base their motion to reargue on Practice Book § 11-12, not on Chapter 13. The standing order does not require this court to hold a hearing on the motion to reargue."
Motion to Open	<u>Stanley v. Stanley</u> , Superior Court, Judicial District of Tolland at Rockville, No. FA-09-4011831S (Dec. 29, 2010) (2010 WL 5644928) (2010 Conn. Super. LEXIS 3364). "Under Practice Book Section 11-18, there is no right to oral argument on motions to withdraw a complaint or on motions to open, and oral argument in civil matters is instead 'at the discretion of the judicial authority.'"
Applicable to Family Cases	<u>Marshall v. Marshall</u> , Superior Court, Judicial District of Stamford-Norwalk at Stamford, No. FST-FA-00-0176688-S (May 6, 2008) (45 Conn. L. Rptr. 440, 441) (2008 WL 2169011) (2008 Conn. Super. LEXIS 1155). "The plaintiff also asserts that she had the right to argument on the motion for protective order. She argues that because P. B. § 11-18 is not referenced in P.B. § 25-23 it does not apply to family matters and therefore plaintiff had a right to argument 'as of right.' P.B. § 25-23 lists certain civil practice book sections that are incorporated in the family rules. This court does not find that listing exclusive. If only those rules referenced in P.B. § 25-23 apply to family matters, then plaintiff's instant motion to reargue pursuant to P.B. § 11-12 would not be permitted and, hence, not be here ruled on."
Incarcerated Party	<u>Tierinni v. Town of Manchester</u> , Superior Court, Judicial District of New Haven at New Haven, No. NNHCv165037155S (July 3, 2017) (2017 WL 3332747) (2017 Conn. Super. LEXIS 3889). "At the plaintiff's request, he participated in the oral argument via video conferencing due to his status as an incarcerated inmate."

<p>Written Response/Time Allotted</p>	<p><u>Schimenti Construction Company, LLC v. Joseph Schimenti</u>, Superior Court, Judicial District of Hartford, No. X07HHDCV186108736S (February 19, 2020) (2020 WL 1230501) (2020 Conn. Super. LEXIS 267) “4. The Court Allowed Ample Oral Argument. Finally, Schimenti Construction says this court’s “likelihood of reversal is high” “because ... the Court here failed to allow SCC to present oral argument on the motion for partial summary judgment on the day it was scheduled for argument, December 9, 2019.” In support it cites the 2019 Appellate Court ruling in <i>Chase Home Finance, LLC. V. Scroggin</i> in which a lower court was reversed for refusing to allow oral argument on a summary judgment motion in the absence of a timely written objection. But this case is not controlled by that one because here the court did the opposite of the court in <i>Chase Home Finance</i>. Unlike that court, this court allowed Schimenti Construction to orally argue the summary judgment motion <i>despite</i> not filing a timely written response. Schimenti Construction does not mention this in its brief. Indeed, the court allowed extensive oral argument on summary judgment on October 22, 2019—the date it was scheduled for—even though Schimenti Construction failed to file its opposition on time. Not only did the court allow oral argument, it accepted Schimenti Construction’s late opposition and even allowed it to file a supplemental memorandum. It has even accepted an additional brief on this pending motion even though Schimenti Construction filed it without permission. What Schimenti Construction complains about here is not refusing to allow oral argument but refusing to allow <i>more</i> oral argument after already having 45 minutes of detailed discussions filling 35 pages of transcript on October 22, 2019. No authority says that oral argument must continue indefinitely or for a set period of time nor do any cases say the court can’t decide after hearing much on one day not to hear any more on a subsequent day.”</p>
--	--