

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 1

July 4, 2017

372 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Antwon W. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 326 C 909	47
Barton v. Norwalk, 326 C 139	19
<i>Inverse condemnation; certification from Appellate Court; whether defendant city's condemnation of parking lot used by tenants substantially destroyed plaintiff property owner's use and enjoyment of subject property; whether claim of highest and best use in previous direct condemnation proceeding barred claim of inverse condemnation predicated on different use under doctrine of judicial estoppel.</i>	
Channing Real Estate, LLC v. Gates, 326 C 123	3
<i>Action to recover on promissory notes; motion to preclude certain evidence; claim that, although Appellate Court properly concluded that parol evidence rule barred introduction of extrinsic evidence to vary terms of notes, that court improperly remanded case for new trial rather than directing judgment for plaintiff and restricting proceedings on remand to hearing in damages; parol evidence rule, discussed; claim that defendant lacked standing to pursue claim alleging violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); whether member of limited liability company has standing to bring action on basis of injury allegedly suffered by limited liability company.</i>	
Green v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 326 C 907	45
Hull v. Hull (Order), 326 C 909	47
Keller v. Keller (Order), 326 C 912	50
New Haven Parking Authority v. Long Wharf Realty Corp. (Order), 326 C 912	50
PMG Land Associates, L.P. v. Harbour Landing Condominium Assn. (Order), 326 C 911	49
Reese v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 326 C 907	45
Rosa v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 326 C 905	43
Shipman v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 326 C 908	46
State v. Bonds (Order), 326 C 907	45
State v. Crenshaw (Order), 326 C 911	49
State v. Henry D. (Order), 326 C 912	50
State v. Killiebrew (Order), 326 C 909	47
State v. Morel (Order), 326 C 911	49
State v. Navarro (Orders), 326 C 910	48
State v. Perez (Order), 326 C 908	46
State v. Petion (Order), 326 C 906	44
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Nelson (Order), 326 C 908	46
William Raveis Real Estate, Inc. v. Zajackowski (Order), 326 C 906	44
Volume 326 Cumulative Table of Cases	51

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

American Express Bank, FSB v. Rutkowski, 174 CA 472	132A
<i>Breach of contractual credit agreement; whether trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment; statute of frauds (§ 52-550 [a] [6]); whether credit card agreement constituted loan exceeding \$50,000 for purposes of statute of frauds.</i>	
Bank of New York Mellon v. Talbot, 174 CA 377	37A
<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court abused discretion in granting second motion for judgment of strict foreclosure; whether, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 17-20 [d]), default for failure to appear was automatically set aside by operation</i>	

(continued on next page)

of law when counsel filed appearance; claim that default for failure to plead was void ab initio because it was entered after first foreclosure motion had been granted erroneously and was, thus, predicated on invalid entry of default; whether second foreclosure judgment was predicated on valid entry of default for failure to plead; whether first foreclosure judgment, which was void initio, had any legal effect or bearing on validity of subsequent default for failure to plead; whether, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 17-32 [b]), default for failure to plead was not automatically set aside and trial court had discretion to deny motion to set aside default where defendant filed answer after plaintiff filed motion for judgment of strict foreclosure.

Crouse v. Cox, 174 CA 343. 3A
Fraud; motion to dismiss.

Crouse v. Sloat (Memorandum Decision), 174 CA 901 139A

EH Investment Co., LLC v. Chappo LLC, 174 CA 344. 4A
Breach of contract; whether lease renewal with lessee was condition precedent to plaintiff lessor's contract with defendants to find lender willing to make commercial loan; claim that trial court improperly construed contract as including condition precedent that required defendants to return plaintiff's deposit; whether trial court gave proper deference to language of fully integrated contract; whether parties to contract failed to fully contemplate occurrence or nonoccurrence of lease extension; whether trial court properly shifted risk from plaintiff to defendants.

Godaire v. Dept. of Social Services, 174 CA 385 45A
Administrative appeal; appeal from judgment of trial court dismissing administrative appeal from decision of Department of Social Services discontinuing plaintiff's medical benefits; claim that plaintiff was denied access to court due to change of venue; whether court properly determined that there was authority for transfer of case to different judicial district pursuant to statute (§ 51-347b [a]); whether, under circumstances of case, hearing officer's decision was made upon unlawful procedure where plaintiff did not have meaningful opportunity to respond to corrected evidence presented by department; whether substantial rights of plaintiff were prejudiced; whether plaintiff, who had been informed by department that eligibility period had been extended, detrimentally relied on such information to meet corrected deadline for obtaining and presenting bill for dental work; whether plaintiff's preexisting eligibility through February, 2015, was required under doctrine of equitable tolling.

Kuriso v. Ziegler, 174 CA 462. 122A
Negligence; action for personal injuries sustained in motor vehicle accident; duty of care; reasonably foreseeable risk; vicarious liability; motion for summary judgment; whether court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of defendant company on both of its motions because court based its rulings on ground not raised in defendant's summary judgment motions; claim that defendant company did not owe duty of care to plaintiff because defendant's alleged negligence did not create reasonably foreseeable risk that alleged harm would occur, as required under first prong of legal duty analysis; claim that vicarious liability could not

(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.

be established because defendant driver was not acting as agent, servant or employee of defendant company at time of collision that caused plaintiff's injuries.

Marra v. Commissioner of Correction, 174 CA 440 100A
Habeas corpus; withdrawal of action; deliberate bypass doctrine; claim that trial court improperly gave preclusive effect to ruling of prior habeas court that petitioner's withdrawal was with prejudice when no hearing on merits had commenced; claim that trial court improperly concluded that doctrine of deliberate bypass barred petitioner's habeas action; whether court's determination that habeas action withdrawn with prejudice implicated court's subject matter jurisdiction.

Pronovost v. Tierney, 174 CA 368 28A
Negligence; personal jurisdiction; whether long arm statute (§ 52-59b [a] [3] [B]), which confers personal jurisdiction over nonresident individual with respect to cause of action arising from tortious act outside Connecticut that causes injury to person or property in Connecticut, provided jurisdiction over defendant; whether, in order to confer jurisdiction over defendant, § 52-59b (a) (3) (B) required that substantial revenue be derived from Connecticut.

State v. Purcell, 174 CA 401 61A
Risk of injury to child; whether trial court abused discretion in denying defendant's motion for mistrial; claim that jury verdict was substantially swayed by testimony that victim had been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder; claim that harmfulness of testimony that victim had been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder could not be cured by court's instruction to jury; whether court improperly denied defendant's motion to suppress statements to police made during custodial interrogation; unpreserved claim that article first, § 8, of state constitution required police to cease questioning during custodial interrogation and to clarify defendant's ambiguous or equivocal references to counsel.

Ampero v. Commissioner of Correction (replacement pages), 171 CA 677-78 v
 State v. Ruiz (replacement pages), 173 CA 623-24 vii
 Williams Ground Services, Inc. v. Jordan (replacement pages), 174 CA 249-50 ix
 Volume 174 Cumulative Table of Cases 141A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK

Revisions to the Superior Court Rules and Forms 1PB

MISCELLANEOUS

Commission on Official Legal Publications Price List, effective July 1, 2017 2C
 Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel 1C