

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXVIII No. 51

June 20, 2017

272 Pages

## Table of Contents

NOTE: Effective July 1, 2017, the Connecticut Law Journal will be available free of charge on the Judicial Branch website, pursuant to General Statutes § 51-216a (b). The printed version of the law journal will no longer be produced once the publication is available online. See notice on page 5B for more information.

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Brian S. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 326 C 904 . . . . .	4
Giuca v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 326 C 903 . . . . .	3
MYM Realty, LLC v. Doe (Order), 326 C 905. . . . .	5
State v. Caballero (Order), 326 C 903. . . . .	3
State v. Sinclair (Order), 326 C 904 . . . . .	4
State v. Snowden (Order), 326 C 903 . . . . .	3
U.S. Bank, National Assn. v. Walbert (Order), 326 C 902 . . . . .	2
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Monaco (Order), 326 C 905. . . . .	5
Volume 326 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	7

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Barjon v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 173 CA 906 . . . . .	72A
Daria M. v. Andrew L. (Memorandum Decision), 173 CA 906 . . . . .	72A
Dowling v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 173 CA 905 . . . . .	71A
Ionescu v. Stratford (Memorandum Decision), 173 CA 906 . . . . .	72A
Shook v. Bartholomew, 173 CA 813. . . . .	3A
<i>Negligence; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly refused to instruct jury that it could apportion liability on basis of comparative fault as requested in proposed charge; whether defendants' written request to charge complied with applicable rules of practice (§§ 16-21 and 16-23); reviewability of claim that trial court improperly permitted plaintiff to introduce character evidence; whether objection on ground of relevance failed to preserve for appellate review claim that testimony was improper character evidence; whether trial court abused discretion in denying motion to set aside verdict.</i>	
Shook v. Eastern Connecticut Health Network, Inc. (See Shook v. Bartholomew), 173 CA 813 . . . . .	3A
State v. Andino, 173 CA 851 . . . . .	41A
<i>Assault in first degree; criminal possession of firearm; claim that trial court improperly found that defendant voluntarily waived rights pursuant to Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436); claim that court made contradictory factual findings; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of criminal possession of firearm; claim that corpus delicti rule required reversal of firearms conviction.</i>	
State v. Lewis, 173 CA 827 . . . . .	17A
<i>Carrying pistol without permit; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; motion to suppress evidence; unlawful search and seizure; whether defendant was seized by police officer when officer stopped patrol car nearby and called to defendant, when officer exited patrol car and approached defendant, or when officer physically touched defendant; claim that police officer's seizure was unlawful because he did not have reasonable and articulable suspicion that defendant was engaged in</i>	

(continued on next page)

*criminal activity; claim that police officer's patdown was unlawful because officer did not have reasonable suspicion that defendant was armed and dangerous.*

State v. Ruiz (replacement pages), 173 CA 607-10 . . . . . v  
 State v. Heath (replacement pages), 173 CA 625-26 . . . . . ix  
 Volume 173 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 73A

Cimino v. Cimino, 174 CA 1 . . . . . 83A  
*Dissolution of marriage; motion to open; abuse of discretion; motion to open judgment on basis of fraud; motion to open judgment on basis of intentional misrepresentation; postjudgment discovery; collateral attack on judgment; credibility of witness; whether dissolution court committed plain error in its valuation of defendant's pension; whether plaintiff's claim regarding valuation of defendant's pension is untimely collateral attack on judgment of dissolution court; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's motion to open, on basis of fraud or intentional misrepresentation, with respect to issue of defendant's pension; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to open judgment, on basis of fraud, with respect to family monetary gifts.*

Grovenburg v. Rustle Meadow Associates, LLC, 174 CA 18 . . . . . 100A  
*Injunction; planned communities; whether trial court improperly precluded defendants from presenting evidence concerning visual buffer area called green zone; whether evidence about green zone was relevant to determination of whether defendants reasonably exercised discretionary authority over design control matters under certain provisions in planned community's declaration (§§ 10.1 [k] and 13.1 [a]) in denying plaintiff owners' proposals to erect fence around swimming pool; court's failure to make certain factual findings to properly analyze reasonableness of defendants' determination under §§ 10.1 (k) and 13.1 (a); remand for new trial; claim that court improperly set aside fines that defendants assessed against plaintiffs for unauthorized landscaping activity and alleged removal of boundary marker; claim that defendants were entitled to award of attorney's fees for portion of counterclaim; whether court improperly declared null and void special assessment that defendants had levied against plaintiffs to cover legal expenses incurred during parties' controversy.*

Pires v. Commissioner of Correction, 174 CA 121 . . . . . 203A  
*Habeas corpus; whether habeas court improperly concluded that trial counsel did not render ineffective assistance in failing to adequately convey to trial court petitioner's desire to represent himself; whether petitioner made clear, unequivocal request for self-representation.*

Reserve Realty, LLC v. BLT Reserve, LLC, 174 CA 150. . . . . 232A  
*Foreclosure; broker's lien; appeal from judgment discharging broker's lien; whether plaintiffs could establish probable cause to sustain validity of broker's lien as required by statute (§ 20-325e).*

Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC, 174 CA 130 . . . . . 212A  
*Breach of contract; antitrust; claim that plaintiffs could not recover brokerage fees under listing agreements because those agreements were product of illegal tying*

(continued on next page)

**CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL**  
 (USPS 5) (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 – Subscription Rates: One year—\$225.00*

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

PRESORT MARKETING PAID AT ENFIELD, CT

---

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

*arrangement in violation of antitrust statute (§ 35-29); whether contracts conditioning sale of land on purchase of real estate brokerage services exclusively from plaintiffs constituted illegal tying arrangement; whether defendants were required to prove existence of relevant market in order to prevail on claim that seller of land had sufficient economic power to restrain competition; whether defendants demonstrated that substantial volume of commerce in tied product was restrained.*

Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC, 174 CA 153 . . . . . 235A  
*Foreclosure; broker’s lien; appeal from judgment discharging broker’s lien; whether plaintiffs could establish probable cause to sustain validity of broker’s lien as required by statute (§ 20-325e).*

Rogers v. Commissioner of Correction, 174 CA 120 . . . . . 202A  
*Habeas corpus; due process; effective assistance of counsel; claim that habeas court erred in concluding that state did not violate petitioner’s right to due process when it withheld third-party culpability evidence from defense in criminal trial; claim that habeas court erred in concluding that petitioner was not denied effective assistance of counsel.*

State v. Ellis, 174 CA 14 . . . . . 96A  
*Motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court improperly dismissed motion to correct; whether sentencing court violated defendant’s federal constitutional right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment pursuant to Miller v. Alabama (567 U.S. 460); claim that trial court should hold new sentencing hearing to determine parole eligibility pursuant to 2015 Public Act (P.A. 15-84) providing that certain juvenile offenders shall be eligible for parole.*

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Owen, 174 CA 102 . . . . . 184A  
*Foreclosure; motion for default for failure to plead; whether trial court abused discretion in denying motion to open strict foreclosure judgment pursuant to statute (§ 49-15); whether defendants had good cause to open strict foreclosure judgment.*

Volume 174 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 239A

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Appellate Court Sessions . . . . . 1B  
 Bar Examining Committee—List of Applicants . . . . . 7B  
 Revised Connecticut Law Journal Deadline Schedule—July through December, 2017. . . 11B  
 Notice of Online Publication of Connecticut Law Journal . . . . . 5B  
 Notices of Attorney Discipline. . . . . 3B  
 Supreme Court Sessions . . . . . 1B

### EXPLANATORY NOTES

---

The Connecticut Law Journal is published in punched, loose-leaf pages to facilitate the ready transfer of its contents to four specially designed ring binders available for purchase at the Commission on Official Legal Publications, 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, CT 06082-4453.

One of those binders is designed for the storage of Supreme Court opinions, a second for the storage of Appellate Court opinions and a third for the storage of Superior Court memoranda of decisions. The fourth binder is designed for the storage of the balance of the contents of the Law Journal.

Updated, cumulative tables of cases for the Connecticut Reports binder, for the Connecticut Appellate Reports binder and for the Connecticut Supplement binder are provided in every edition of the Law Journal. Thus, only the most recent table for each of those binders need be retained. As each bound edition of the Connecticut Reports, of the Connecticut Appellate Reports and of the Connecticut Supplement becomes available, the loose-leaf contents of the binder for that volume may be discarded.

Please notify the Office of the Reporter of Judicial Decisions at once of any error noticed herein.

MICHAEL A. GENTILE  
*Acting Reporter of Judicial Decisions*  
Drawer N, Station A  
Hartford, CT 06106  
(860) 757-2250