

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 3

July 18, 2017

334 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Micek-Holt v. Papageorge (Order), 326 C 915	25
State v. Schovanec, 326 C 310	2
<i>Identity theft third degree; illegal use of credit card; credit card theft; larceny sixth degree; whether trial court improperly denied defendant's request for jury instruction on third-party culpability and excluded references to third-party culpability from argument; unpreserved claim that certain of defendant's convictions violated constitutional prohibition against double jeopardy.</i>	
State v. Williams-Bey (Order), 326 C 920.	30
Taylor v. Commissioner of Correction (replacement pages), 324 C 637–38	v
In re Santiago G. (replacement pages), 325 C 235–36	vii
Volume 326 Cumulative Table of Cases	33

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Cathedral Green, Inc. v. Hughes, 174 CA 608	38A
<i>Summary process; noncompliance with stipulated judgment; order of execution; claim that trial court improperly relied on facts not in evidence and not supported by record; claim that trial court failed to properly adjudicate defendant's equitable nonforfeiture defense.</i>	
Clinton S. v. Commissioner of Correction, 174 CA 821.	251A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused discretion denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that defense counsel had rendered ineffective assistance at criminal trial when counsel failed to present certain evidence of conversation victim had with witness regarding petitioner's status as registered sex offender; claim that defense counsel failed to adequately investigate and present evidence of petitioner's employment history and that of victim's mother in support of defense that petitioner had no opportunity to assault victim; claim that habeas court applied wrong standard in determining whether petitioner was prejudiced by failure of defense counsel to produce employment records of victim's mother.</i>	
Deutsche Bank AG v. Sebastian Holdings, Inc., 174 CA 573	3A
<i>Enforcement of foreign judgment; claim seeking to pierce corporate veil; summary judgment; res judicata; collateral estoppel; claim that trial court improperly denied defendants' motion for summary judgment because plaintiff's corporate veil piercing claim arose out of same series of transactions as foreign action and should have been raised in that action; whether plaintiff's claim was barred by doctrine of res judicata; claim that trial court improperly denied plaintiff's motion for summary judgment because issue of whether individual defendant was alter ego of corporate defendant previously had been decided in foreign action; whether doctrine of collateral estoppel precluded defendants from relitigating alter ego issue in trial court; whether facts relevant to issues in foreign action and those in present action were identical for purposes of issue preclusion.</i>	
Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction, 174 CA 776	206A
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner's right to due process and fair trial were violated by prosecutor's failure to disclose material evidence that was favorable to defense; claim that counsel in prior habeas proceeding rendered ineffective assistance because they failed to identify, understand, research, raise, or argue that petitioner's rights to due process and fair trial were violated by prosecutor's failure to disclose material evidence that was favorable to defense.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Freeman v. A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc., 174 CA 649	79A
<i>Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.); (§ 42-110b-28 [b] [1]) of state regulations; fraudulent misrepresentation; whether trial court erred as matter of law in concluding that defendant violated CUTPA; criteria pursuant to federal cigarette rule for determining whether trade practice is unfair, set forth and discussed; whether trial court erred as matter of law in concluding that defendant committed fraudulent misrepresentation by nondisclosure of material facts; whether trial court erred as matter of law in awarding punitive damages and attorney's fees.</i>	
Lederle v. Spivey, 174 CA 592	22A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court abused discretion in awarding attorney's fees pursuant to bad faith exception to general rule that attorney's fees are not allowed to successful party in absence of contractual or statutory exception; whether, in order to impose sanctions under bad faith exception pursuant to inherent authority, trial court must find both that litigant's claims were entirely without color and that litigant acted in bad faith; whether trial court's findings concerning bad faith exception must be supported with high degree of specificity; whether trial court failed to apply proper standard in awarding attorney's fees when court failed to delineate finding that defendant's prior appeal lacked any indicia of colorable claim with clear evidence and high degree of specificity; whether record demonstrated that trial court applied correct standard for colorability applicable to party, as opposed to attorney, and that it thus considered whether defendant's principal claim in previous appeal was so lacking in factual and legal support that reasonable person could not have concluded that basis of claim might be established.</i>	
Mahoney v. Storch Smith, 174 CA 639	69A
<i>Medical malpractice; motion to set aside verdict and for new trial; claim that defendants' use of video violated expert disclosure rules under rule of practice (§ 13-4), because video and related testimony from defendants' expert, were not disclosed pursuant to that provision; claim that video, and testimony of defendants' expert concerning it, were irrelevant, unduly cumulative, prejudicial and confusing to jury; claim that trial court improperly denied plaintiffs' motion to set aside verdict and for new trial in light of fact that trial court did not instruct jury that video was for demonstrative purposes only; claim that trial court abused its discretion by allegedly discouraging jury from rehearing expert medical testimony during jury's deliberations.</i>	
Maluccio v. Zoning Board of Appeals, 174 CA 750	180A
<i>Zoning appeal; whether decision of defendant zoning board of appeals was illegal and not supported by record; claim that trial court improperly found that recreation area designation on subdivision map created only private right or restriction unenforceable by zoning law; whether subdivision regulations required developer to designate property as recreation area; whether planning commission had required recreation area when approving subdivision; claim that trial court erred in determining that town was required to accept title to property to effectuate recreation area designation.</i>	

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
Office of Production and Distribution
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*Published Weekly – Available at <http://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
MICHAEL A. GENTILE, *Acting Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

Reyes v. Medina Loveras, LLC, 174 CA 804	234A
<i>Negligence; hearsay rule; statement by party opponent exception to hearsay rule; hospital records exception to hearsay rule; claim that trial court improperly admitted into evidence photograph of plaintiff's uninjured buttock because it was irrelevant; claim that trial court improperly admitted into evidence portion of plaintiff's hospital records because it was inadmissible hearsay.</i>	
Ring v. Litchfield Bancorp, 174 CA 813.	243A
<i>Whether defendant violated Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110 et seq.) by exercising right to setoff; claim that trial court erred in striking plaintiff's amended complaint by concluding that she failed to plead cognizable cause of action under act; whether plaintiff's claim on appeal was waived because amended complaint was not materially different from stricken original complaint; whether new factual allegations in amended complaint corrected deficiencies identified by trial court when it granted motion to strike original complaint.</i>	
Santander Bank, N.A. v. Godek, 174 CA 748.	178A
<i>Foreclosure; foreclosure by sale; whether trial court committed reversible error.</i>	
State v. Carter, 174 CA 749.	179A
<i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court should have denied, rather than dismissed, defendant's motion to correct illegal sentence alleging that imposition of consecutive sentences was not authorized by statute.</i>	
State v. O'Donnell, 174 CA 675	105A
<i>Bribery of witness; tampering with witness; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of bribery of witness; whether evidence was insufficient to prove charge of tampering with witness; reviewability of claim that "one-witness-plus-corroboration" rule applicable to perjury prosecutions should apply to conviction of tampering with witness; claim that trial court abused discretion in denying motion to set aside verdict; claim that court improperly failed to give jury instruction regarding "one-witness-plus-corroboration" rule; claim that court erred when it refused request that witness testify in proffer outside jury's presence and permitted witness to invoke fifth amendment privilege in front of jury; whether court abused discretion in granting motion to quash subpoena for information related to witness protection program.</i>	
State v. Sampson, 174 CA 624	54A
<i>Interfering with officer; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to confrontation by granting motion in limine to exclude certain evidence; whether excluded evidence related to ability or propensity of witness to tell truth; whether constitutional claim necessarily failed where trial court properly determined that evidence was not relevant; whether trial court abused discretion by finding inadmissible certain testimony; whether excluded testimony related to collateral issue that was not directly relevant to elements of crime charged, tended to prove or to disprove any element of charged offense, or was relevant to issue of reasonableness of use of force by police officer; whether defendant's right to present defense was violated.</i>	
State v. Young, 174 CA 760.	190A
<i>Assault in first degree; carrying pistol without permit; sufficiency of evidence; supplemental jury instruction; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support conviction of assault in first degree; claim that trial court abused discretion by admitting into evidence names of defendant's prior felony convictions; whether probative value of evidence of prior felony convictions outweighed its prejudicial effect; claim that court abused discretion by giving supplemental charge to jury in which it named prior felony convictions.</i>	
Stones Trail, LLC v. Weston, 174 CA 715.	145A
<i>Inverse condemnation; ripeness; violation of constitutional rights; whether trial court improperly set aside jury verdict; whether court improperly dismissed action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that finality of judgments doctrine barred court from reconsidering whether it had subject matter jurisdiction; claim that law of case doctrine barred court from revisiting issue of ripeness; whether court properly determined that plaintiff did not have vested rights in its configuration of real property; claim that court improperly relied on prior decision of this court in determining that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction; whether court improperly rejected claim that it would have been futile to seek subdivision approval; claim that ripeness review did not apply to claims of violation of certain constitutional rights; claim that court materially changed its initial decision when it filed revised memorandum of decision.</i>	
Volume 174 Cumulative Table of Cases	273A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries	1B
---------------------	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Bar Examining Committee	2C
Notices of Attorney Discipline	4C
Small Claims Decentralization	1C
