

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 15

October 9, 2018

169 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Hamburg v. Hamburg (Order), 330 C 916	30
Hum v. Silvester (Order), 330 C 919	33
Mercado v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 918	32
St. Juste v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 917	31
State v. Corver (Order), 330 C 916	30
State v. Fletcher (Order), 330 C 918	32
State v. Harris (Order), 330 C 918	32
State v. Papineau (Order), 330 C 916	30
State v. Ramos (Order), 330 C 917	31
Sun Val, LLC v. Commissioner of Transportation, 330 C 316	2
<i>Negligence; claim that trial court improperly considered certain regulations governing remediation; claim that trial court improperly failed to adopt removal plan proposed by expert witness; claim that trial court's award of damages was insufficient; whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiff landowner failed to mitigate damages resulting from deposit of material on plaintiff's property; whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiff had failed to prove element of proximate causation with respect to claim for lost profits.</i>	
Volume 330 Cumulative Table of Cases	35

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC v. Beckford (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 905	113A
Bloomfield Health Care Center of Connecticut, LLC v. Doyon, 185 CA 340	60A
<i>Negligence; summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that defendant did not owe duty to plaintiff to use reasonable care in performing his duties as conservator of estate of his ward who was receiving care at plaintiff's facility; whether harm suffered by plaintiff because of defendant's failure to timely submit ward's application for Medicaid benefits in order to obtain available public assistance funds for cost of patient's care was foreseeable as matter of law; claim that harm to plaintiff was not foreseeable because defendant was not in privity with plaintiff; whether public policy supported recognizing that defendant owed duty to plaintiff to use reasonable care in administration and management of ward's estate; discussion of statutory (§ 45a-655 [a]) duties of conservator of estate.</i>	
Ferrua v. Napoli Foods, Inc. (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 904	112A
Gonzalez v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 903	111A
Grant v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 904	112A
Guddo v. Guddo, 185 CA 283	3A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; contempt; reviewability of unpreserved claim that hearing on motion for contempt was unfair in that at time of the hearing, both parties were represented by same law firm, which created conflict of interest, and that law firm violated numerous professional rules of conduct; failure of plaintiff to raise claim before trial court; whether it would have been appropriate to afford extraordinary level of review to claim.</i>	
Jenkins v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 905	113A
Lindsay v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 903	111A

(continued on next page)

Roberson v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 904.	112A
Robles v. West Avenue Dental, P.C., 185 CA 379	99A
<i>Negligent supervision; reviewability of claim that trial court misconstrued jury's original verdict as ambiguous and erred in returning jury for further deliberations with instructions that it could not return plaintiff's verdict without awarding plaintiff damages; failure of defendants to object to jury instructions given by court or to court's decision to return jury for further deliberations.</i>	
Sosa v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 903.	111A
State v. Bailey (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 905.	113A
State v. Correa, 185 CA 308	28A
<i>Conspiracy to possess controlled substance with intent to sell; conspiracy to possess controlled substance with intent to sell by person who is not drug-dependent; conspiracy to operate drug factory; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress evidence seized from defendant's motel room after police conducted warrantless canine sniff of front door of motel room; unpreserved claim that warrantless dog sniff outside door to motel room violated defendant's rights under article first, § 7, of state constitution; claim that police were required to obtain warrant before conducting dog sniff search of pathway outside of defendant's motel room; whether defendant demonstrated reasonable expectation of privacy on outside of door to motel room, which was open, shared walkway that was located outside of structure and visible to and accessible by any member of public; whether defendant established plain error; claim that conduct of police in opening door to motel room and conducting visual sweep of room without warrant was unlawful under federal and state constitutions; whether trial court properly concluded that search was lawful under exigent circumstances exception to warrant requirement; whether probable cause existed to search motel room; whether, under totality of circumstances, reasonable, well trained police officer reasonably would have believed that immediate entry into motel room was necessary to prevent destruction of evidence.</i>	
State v. Meadows, 185 CA 287.	7A
<i>Criminal violation of standing criminal protective order; threatening in second degree; claim that conviction of two counts of criminal violation of standing criminal protective order violated defendant's right to be free from double jeopardy; whether offenses charged in subject counts arose out of same act; whether defendant's conversation with victim was separable into distinct acts, each punishable as separate offenses under applicable statute (§ 53a-223a); claim that trial court erroneously instructed jury as to second count of criminal violation of standing criminal protective order by providing jury with incorrect definition of "harassing conduct," instead of using higher standard set forth in State v. Larsen (117 Conn. App. 202); claim that defendant's conviction of threatening in second degree pursuant to statute ([Rev. to 2015] § 53a-62 [a] [3]) should be reversed; whether statute violated first amendment to United States constitution; claim that true threats doctrine required that defendant possessed subjective intent to threaten victim; whether objective standard for true threats doctrine remained valid.</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 <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

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.

Volume 185 Cumulative Table of Cases 115A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel 1C
Notice of Pendency of Reinstatement Application 2C
Notice of Suspension of Attorney 1C
Office of State Ethics Advisory Opinion 3C
