

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 11

September 12, 2017

235 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

State v. Fay, 326 C 742	2
<i>Manslaughter second degree with firearm; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional rights to present defense and to compulsory process when it declined to examine homicide victim's privileged psychiatric records, which were protected by statutory (§§ 52-146d and 52-146e) psychiatrist-patient privilege, or to consider testimony by victim's psychiatrist in camera; claim that record was inadequate for review, under State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233), of defendant's unpreserved claims of constitutional error; whether and, if so, when defendant in homicide case who raises claim of self-defense is entitled to in camera review of victim's psychiatric records; psychiatrist-patient privilege, discussed; standard for in camera review of witness' psychiatric records in State v. Esposito (192 Conn. 166), discussed.</i>	
Volume 326 Cumulative Table of Cases	33

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Rodriguez, 176 CA 392	146A
<i>Arbitration; whether trial court properly denied application to vacate arbitration award; whether submission to arbitrator was unrestricted; whether issue of possession and title to vehicle was within scope of submission; whether arbitrator, by ordering return of vehicle to plaintiff, exceeded power by rendering award that was beyond unrestricted submission of parties; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly ordered plaintiff to pay attorney's fees and costs; failure to brief claim adequately.</i>	
Dinino v. Federal Express Corp., 176 CA 248	2A
<i>Workers' compensation; exceptions to exclusivity provision of Workers' Compensation Act (§ 31-293a); summary judgment; claim court erred in concluding there was no genuine issue of material fact regarding motor vehicle exception based on coworker's alleged negligence; claim court erred in concluding there was no genuine issue of material fact regarding substantial certainty exception for employer's alleged intentional tort.</i>	
Financial Freedom Acquisition, LLC v. Griffin, 176 CA 314	68A
<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court properly determined that substitute plaintiff established prima facie case of foreclosure; whether trial court's conclusion that substitute plaintiff was holder and owner of note executed by decedent was legally and factually correct; whether production of note, endorsed in blank, at trial created rebuttable presumption that substitute plaintiff was owner of note; claim that substitute plaintiff's status as holder and owner of note and foreclosure action were affected by merger and change of name of substitute plaintiff that occurred during pendency of foreclosure action; claim that named plaintiff breached covenant of good faith and fair dealing when it initiated foreclosure action instead of communicating with executrix to facilitate sale of property; whether trial court properly found that defendants failed to meet burden of proof with respect to special defense and counterclaim sounding in breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; whether note created contractual right to extend deadline for payment.</i>	

(continued on next page)

- Kenneson v. Eggert, 176 CA 296. 50A
Fraud; whether trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to claim for intentional misrepresentation and determined that claim was precluded by collateral estoppel; whether claim for intentional misrepresentation was fully and fairly litigated and actually decided in prior action; whether for collateral estoppel to bar relitigation issue sought to be relitigated must be identical to one decided in prior proceeding; claim that because alleged misrepresentation did not relate to past or existing fact, it was not actionable; claim that, given inconsistencies in plaintiff's allegations, claim against defendants should be disposed of pursuant to sham affidavit rule; credibility of witnesses; whether trial court properly determined that no genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether plaintiff could establish claim for fraudulent nondisclosure; whether, to establish claim of fraudulent nondisclosure, plaintiff had to prove that parties' relationship imposed duty on defendant to disclose; whether trial court abused discretion in denying motions for compliance; whether trial court properly determined that documents sought by plaintiff were protected by attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine.
- Luongo Construction & Development, LLC v. MacFarlane, 176 CA 272 26A
Contracts; unfair trade practices; claim that trial court improperly denied motions to dismiss that were based on prior pending action doctrine; whether court properly denied motion for summary judgment as to counterclaim; whether court improperly failed to consider claim concerning prior pending action doctrine in denying motion for summary judgment; whether nonmoving party had no obligation to submit evidence establishing existence of genuine issue of material fact where party moving for summary judgment failed to establish that no genuine issue of material fact existed; whether court abused discretion in awarding punitive damages pursuant to unfair trade practices act (42-110a et seq.).
- McClancy v. Bank of America, N.A., 176 CA 408 162A
Contracts; summary judgment; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment when issues of material fact existed with respect to breach of contract claims; failure to brief claim adequately; claim that trial court erred in failing to determine that breach of contract claim fell within purported promissory estoppel exception to statute of frauds; whether promissory estoppel exception to statute of frauds exists; whether plaintiffs provided evidence of promise made to grant loan modification; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment on claim of negligent misrepresentation; whether plaintiffs presented evidence that representation that bank would evaluate loan for possible modification was false when made; whether trial court erred in granting summary judgment when genuine issues of material fact existed; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment on claim alleging violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); whether plaintiffs presented evidence raising genuine issue of material fact about whether bank engaged in unfair or deceptive practices or violated any identifiable public policy in association with loan modification application.

(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
 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.

State v. Elmer G., 176 CA 343 97A
Sexual assault in second degree; risk of injury to child; criminal violation of restraining order; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of sexual assault in second degree; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of three counts of criminal violation of restraining order; claim that state failed to prove restraining orders applied to victim; whether there was sufficient evidence to prove defendant knew terms of restraining orders; claim that prosecutorial improprieties deprived defendant of right to fair trial; whether defendant, in claiming that certain questions by prosecutor constituted improper attempts to bolster victim's credibility, was attempting to transform unpreserved evidentiary claim into constitutional claim of prosecutorial impropriety.
Volume 176 Cumulative Table of Cases 175A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Social Services, Department of 1C

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Attorney Discipline 2D
Notice of Disbarment of Attorney 2D
Notice of Suspension of Attorney 3D
Small Claims Decentralization 1D