CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 13

September 25, 2018

179 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

| Akers v. University of Connecticut Law School (Order), 330 C 902 Amelio v. Monthie (Orders), 330 C 907. Angersola v. Radiologic Associates of Middletown, P.C., 330 C 251 Wrongful death action pursuant to statute (§ 52-555); motions to dismiss plaintiffs' action on ground that plaintiffs failed to commence action within five year repose period set forth in § 52-555; motion for limited discovery of disputed facts related to trial court's jurisdiction; claim that repose period of § 52-555 had been tolled as to all defendants in accordance with continuing course of conduct and continuing course of treatment doctrines; whether trial court correctly determined that failure to comply with repose provision of § 52-555 deprives trial court of subject matter jurisdiction over action brought pursuant to that statute; claim that plaintiffs could not invoke continuing course of conduct and continuing doctrines as basis for extending repose period set forth in § 52-555; whether plaintiffs properly preserved their claim for evidentiary hearing to address disputed issues of fact in support of their tolling claims; whether trial court correctly concluded that record did not support application of continuing course of treatment doctrine; whether trial court properly denied plaintiffs' request for limited discovery or for evidentiary hearing before it ruled on motions to dismiss, in order to resolve disputed jurisdictional facts related to claim that repose period of § 52-555 was tolled by continuing course of conduct doctrine. | 36 41 3 |
|---|-----------------|
| Battistotti v. Suzanne A. (Order), 330 C 904 | $\frac{38}{35}$ |
| , | |

| But about of building (of del), soo e soll first | - |
|--|---|
| Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC v. Park City Sports, LLC (Order), 330 C 901 | 5 |
| Clements v. Aramark Corp. (Order), 330 C 904 | 3 |
| Desmond v. Yale-New Haven Hospital, Inc. (Order), 330 C 902 | 3 |
| Francis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 903 | 7 |
| Georges v. OB-GYN Services, P.C. (Order), 330 C 905 | 9 |
| In re James H. (Order) (See In re Katherine H.), 330 C 906 |) |
| In re Katherine H. (Order), 330 C 906 | 0 |
| In re Zoey H. (Order), 330 C 906 |) |
| Lewis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 906 | 0 |
| Murray v. Suffield Police Dept. (Order), 330 C 902 | 3 |
| State v. Bagnaschi (Order), $330 C 907$ | 1 |
| State v. Hearl (Order), 330 C 903 | 7 |
| Tedesco v. Agoli (Order), 330 C 905 330 C 905 <th< td=""><td>9</td></th<> | 9 |
| Traylor v. Gambrell (Order), 330 C 901 | 5 |
| White v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 904 | 3 |
| Volume 330 Cumulative Table of Cases | 3 |
| | |

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

| Boria v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 901 | 123A |
|--|------|
| Carolina v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 902 | 124A |
| Dahle v. Stop & Shop Supermarket Co., LLC, 185 CA 71 | 73A |
| Workers' compensation; appeal from decision of Compensation Review Board | |
| affirming decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner dismissing plain- | |
| tiff's claim that she was entitled to temporary total disability benefits without | |
| social security offset pursuant to statute ([Rev. to 2003] § 31-307 [e]); claim that | |
| plaintiff should have been awarded benefits without social security offset because | |
| 1 00 0 00 | |

(continued on next page)

© 2018 by The Secretary of the State, State of Connecticut

errors and delays by commissioner and board resulted in delay in obtaining compensation, which made her subject to offset; whether board erred by refusing to address plaintiff's attempt to correct past incorrect evidence and to introduce new evidence to prove that delays beyond her control made her subject to social security offset; whether board erred by failing to address commissioner's alleged statement that plaintiff's medical treatment was delayed; whether board erred in affirming commissioner's denial of plaintiff's request for financial compensation without social security offset. Dubinsky v. Black, 185 CA 53 55A Legal malpractice; malicious prosecution; risk of injury to child; whether trial court erred in granting motion for summary judgment on ground that there was probable cause to charge plaintiff with crimes of assault and risk of injury to child; claim that arresting officers lacked probable cause in light of parental justification defense under statute (§ 53a-18 [1]); claim that trial court erred in granting motion for summary judgment because arresting officers fabricated claim that defendant left red welts on son's backside; whether plaintiff could demonstrate that he would have been entitled to judgment in malicious prosecution action against arresting officers but for defendant's professional negligence. State v. Carter (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 902 124A 123A 95A Felony murder; burglary in first degree; criminal possession of firearm; unpreserved claim that prosecutor's alleged generic tailoring argument in closing remarks to jury violated defendant's rights under state constitution to be present at trial and to confront witnesses against him; claim that certain comments of prosecutor violated defendant's rights to due process and fair trial; claim that prosecutor's alleged generic tailoring remarks deprived defendant of general due process right to fair trial. State v. Ruiz-Pacheco, 185 CA 1. 3A Assault in first degree; attempt to commit murder; conspiracy to commit assault in first degree; unpreserved claim that conviction of two counts each of assault in first degree as principal and as accessory violated defendant's right against double jeopardy; claim that conviction of accessory counts should be vacated; whether acts of stabbing victims were susceptible of separation into distinct criminal acts for which defendant could be punished without violating principles of double jeopardy; whether jury reasonably could have determined that defendant was guilty as principal actor for stab or stabs he inflicted on one victim and as accessorial actor for intentionally aiding in nearly simultaneous stab or stabs defendant's brother inflicted on same victim; unpreserved claim that trial court's jury instructions on attempted murder deprived defendant of fair trial, where court utilized phrase, "engaged in anything," in three instances, read full statutory definition of general and specific intent, and allegedly failed to adequately define $substantial \, step \, element \, for \, attempt; whether \, separate \, claims \, of \, error \, taken \, together$ deprived defendant of fair trial; unpreserved claim that trial court improperly

(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 <u>https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal</u>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by ERIC M. LEVINE, *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.

instructed jury on defenses of self-defense and defense of others, and on lesser included offenses of assault in second degree and assault in third degree because court's instructions on self-defense permitted jury to consider lesser included offenses if state failed to disprove self-defense beyond reasonable doubt; waiver of right to challenge jury instructions; whether jury instructions constituted obvious and undebatable error so as to establish manifest injustice or fundamental unfairness pursuant to plain error doctrine; claim that multiple instances of prosecutorial impropriety during closing arguments deprived defendant of fair trial; whether prosecutor argued facts that were not in evidence or improperly appealed to emotions of jurors.
Varoglu v. Sciarrino, 185 CA 84

| Varoglu v. Sciarrino, 185 CA 84 | 86A |
|---|------|
| Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly found that plaintiff had | |
| purchased condominium by using funds from loan that was secured by marital | |
| home; claim that trial court improperly failed to award plaintiff more than 40 | |
| percent of net proceeds from sale of marital home; claim that trial court, in | |
| fashioning orders pertaining to distribution of equity in marital home, failed to | |
| adequately take into account plaintiff's role in preserving marital property. | |
| Wiggins v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 901 | 123A |
| Volume 185 Cumulative Table of Cases | 125A |
| | |

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

| Social Services, Department of | , | 1B, 2B |
|--------------------------------|---|--------|
|--------------------------------|---|--------|

MISCELLANEOUS

| | C |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Notice of Reinstatement of Attorney | С |
| Notice of Suspension of Attorney | С |