

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 30

January 23, 2018

344 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Bank of New York Mellon v. Worth (Order), 327 C 1000 . . . . .	196
Beck & Beck, LLC v. Costello (Order), 327 C 1000 . . . . .	196
Connecticut Coalition for Justice in Education Funding, Inc. v. Rell, 327 C 650 . . . . .	76
<i>Declaratory and injunctive relief; claim that state's failure to provide suitable and substantially equal educational opportunities violated individual plaintiffs' rights to free education under Connecticut constitution (art. VIII, § 1), and equal rights (art. I, § 1) and equal protection (art. I, § 20, as amended) provisions of Connecticut constitution; claim that individual plaintiffs lacked standing because they failed to present evidence of specific injury; whether named plaintiff lacked associational standing under Connecticut Assn. of Health Care Facilities, Inc. v. Worrell (199 Conn. 609); claim that trial court improperly allowed plaintiffs to amend complaint and cure jurisdictional defect on ground that named plaintiff had no members when original complaint was filed; whether named plaintiff did not meet first prong of Worrell test because parent members lacked right to vote; whether potential conflicts of interest among members of named plaintiff deprived it of associational standing; whether named plaintiff satisfied third prong of Worrell because neither claim asserted nor relief requested required participation of individual members; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that state's educational system met criteria set forth in Campaign for Fiscal Equity, Inc. v. State (86 N.Y.2d 307) (Campaign I), and adopted in concurring opinion in Connecticut Coalition for Justice in Education Funding, Inc. v. Rell (295 Conn. 240); whether concurring opinion provided controlling constitutional standard; whether standard that trial court applied to claim under article eighth, § 1, was inconsistent with concurring opinion in Rell; whether trial court improperly applied constitutional standard of its own devising after concluding that Campaign I criteria were met; whether trial court violated separation of powers principles by applying constitutional standard of its own devising; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that evidence did not support plaintiffs' claim that Campaign I criteria were not met; whether plaintiffs established that disparities in educational funding between neediest and least needy school districts violated equal rights and protection provisions of state constitution under Horton v. Meskill (195 Conn. 24); claim that there could be no equal rights or protection violation if plaintiffs were receiving minimally adequate educational opportunity under article eighth, § 1; whether evidence supported prima facie showing by plaintiffs that disparities in educational funding were more than de minimis; whether defendants satisfied second and third parts of Horton, which required them to prove that disparities in education spending were justified by legitimate state policy and were not so great as to be unconstitutional.</i>	
Fernschild v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles (Order), 327 C 997 . . . . .	193
McFarlane v. Mickens (Order), 327 C 997 . . . . .	193
Smith v. Redding (Order), 327 C 996 . . . . .	192
State v. Eddie N. C. (Order), 327 C 1000 . . . . .	196
State v. Fowler (Order), 327 C 999 . . . . .	195
State v. Holley, 327 C 576 . . . . .	2
<i>Felony murder; home invasion; conspiracy to commit home invasion; burglary in first degree; robbery in first degree; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had violated defendant's constitutional right to present defense by imposing condition on decision to preclude admission of accomplice's</i>	

(continued on next page)

*statements that were otherwise barred under Crawford v. Washington (541 U.S. 36); whether unpreserved claim was constitutional in nature; whether Appellate Court improperly ordered new trial on basis of its determination that trial court's conditional ruling violated defendant's right to present defense; whether unpreserved claim failed under State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233); whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had abused its discretion in admitting lay opinion testimony from police detective that he observed what appeared to be bite mark on accomplice's hand; whether Appellate Court incorrectly determined that trial court had abused its discretion in admitting lay opinion testimony of another police detective that contours of object in defendant's backpack appeared to be those of shoe box; whether trial court's admission of lay opinion testimony, even if improper, was harmless; claims, raised as alternative grounds for affirming Appellate Court's judgment; that trial court improperly admitted testimony from two witnesses who were on bus that defendant and his accomplice were riding after commission of charged crimes, and testimony from police detective; claim, raised as alternative ground for affirming Appellate Court's judgment, that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion for mistrial in response to police detective's testimony that defendant's accomplice stated to him that injury on accomplice's hand was bite.*

State v. Jackson (Order), 327 C 998 . . . . . 194  
 State v. Manning (Order), 327 C 999 . . . . . 195  
 State v. Sienkiewicz (Order), 327 C 997 . . . . . 193  
 State v. Stallworth (Order), 327 C 998 . . . . . 194  
 State v. Taylor (Order), 327 C 998 . . . . . 194  
 State v. Walker (Order), 327 C 999 . . . . . 195  
 Volume 327 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 197

**CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS**

American Eagle Federal Credit Union v. Shivers (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 902 . . 112A  
 Brown v. Commissioner of Correction, 179 CA 358 . . . . . 90A  
*Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that state violated petitioner's due process rights by suppressing material exculpatory evidence in violation of Brady v. Maryland (373 U.S. 83) when state allegedly failed to disclose to petitioner certain agreements with witnesses to bring their cooperation in petitioner's criminal trial to attention of court in their criminal proceedings; whether habeas court's finding that state disclosed agreements to petitioner prior to criminal trial was clearly erroneous; claim that state failed to disclose alleged agreements with witnesses to give them favorable treatment at bond hearings in exchange for their testimony; claim that state did not correct false testimony by witnesses at criminal trial; claim that petitioner's trial counsel was ineffective in failing to adequately cross-examine witnesses; whether petitioner demonstrated that he was prejudiced by failure of trial counsel to obtain transcripts of witnesses' bond hearings.*

(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.

Bruno v. HSBC Bank USA, N.A. (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 902 . . . . . 112A  
 Castelino v. Fairview Condominium Assn., Inc. (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 902 . . 112A  
 Cinotti v. Bacoulis (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 903 . . . . . 113A  
 DeJesus v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 902 . . . . . 112A  
 Finney v. Cameron’s Auto Towing Repair, 179 CA 301. . . . . 33A  
     *Contracts; whether trial court properly determined that defendant was entitled to summary judgment on complaint; whether defendant established that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to its right to prevail on claim that it breached contract to repair plaintiff’s vehicle and that unpaid storage fees that accrued resulted from its delay in giving plaintiff estimate of cost to repair vehicle; whether trial court erred in granting motion for summary judgment in favor of defendant on its counterclaim; whether defendant failed to state any basis on which it was entitled to judgment on counterclaim.*  
 Gamble v. Commissioner of Correction, 179 CA 285 . . . . . 17A  
     *Habeas corpus; claim that appellate counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to raise claim of insufficient evidence on direct appeal; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner failed to prove that he was prejudiced by performance of appellate counsel; whether it was reasonably probable that petitioner would have prevailed on sufficiency of evidence claim on direct appeal; whether there was sufficient evidence to support petitioner’s conviction of manslaughter as accessory under concert of action theory; whether there is meaningful distinction between principal and accessorial liability as matter of law; claim that evidence supported only conviction as principal shooter and not as accessory; whether doctrine of collateral estoppel applied to review of sufficiency of evidence; whether petitioner’s acquittals on other charges precluded court from examining all evidence presented at trial; inconsistent verdicts.*  
 HSBC Bank USA, N.A. v. Bliss (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 904 . . . . . 114A  
 JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. v. Porzio (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 903. . . . . 113A  
 State v. Andrews (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 903 . . . . . 113A  
 State v. Brown, 179 CA 337 . . . . . 69A  
     *Possession of more than four ounces of marijuana; subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court lacked jurisdiction to consider merits of petition for writ of error coram nobis; whether trial court improperly denied petition and, instead, should have rendered judgment dismissing petition; whether defendant had prior alternative legal remedies available to him regarding ineffective assistance of counsel claim.*  
 State v. Manousos, 179 CA 310 . . . . . 42A  
     *Arson in first degree; whether trial court improperly denied motions to suppress statements defendant made to police and items police seized during investigatory stop and patdown for weapons; claim that police lacked reasonable and articulable suspicion that defendant was involved in criminal activity; claim that patdown of defendant for weapons was improper because totality of circumstances did not support trial court’s finding that police reasonably believed that defendant may have been armed and dangerous; whether propriety of investigatory stop and subsequent patdown made it reasonable for police to enlarge scope of search by seizing items defendant was carrying; whether trial court abused its discretion by compelling defendant to disclose to state prior to trial substance of opinions of expert witness; claim that court’s actions impaired defendant’s ability to present defense and diluted right to assistance of counsel.*  
 State v. Outlaw, 179 CA 345 . . . . . 77A  
     *Assault of public safety personnel; plain error; whether defendant explicitly waived claim that trial court failed to give detailed instruction concerning whether correction officer was acting in performance of duties in alleged use of unnecessary or unreasonable force; whether defendant demonstrated that trial court committed plain error by failing to instruct jury that unwarranted or excessive force by correction officer was not within performance of officer’s duties.*  
 State v. Tucker, 179 CA 270 . . . . . 2A  
     *Probation; assault in third degree; claim that trial court erred in admitting 911 recording into evidence; claim that trial court erroneously found that defendant violated probation; claim that trial court abused its discretion in imposing sentence of three years incarceration; whether trial court properly overruled objection to admission of 911 recording that was based on lack of foundation for recording; whether trial court properly authenticated 911 recording; whether defendant sustained burden of providing adequate record to review claim of due process violation; whether admission of recording constituted plain error; whether trial court properly found that defendant violated probation; whether trial court abused its discretion in revoking defendant’s probation.*

Walsh Fence, LLC *v.* Dolceaqua (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 904 . . . . . 114A  
Volume 179 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 115A

**CONNECTICUT CODE OF EVIDENCE**

Adoption of Revisions to the Connecticut Code of Evidence (Correction) . . . . . 1PB

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Office of the Chief Public Defender. . . . . 1B

---