



**2019 Edition**

# Municipal Tax Sales (Extra-Judicial)

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

## **Table of Contents**

Section 1: Municipal Tax Sales (Extra-Judicial)..... 3

    Constitutionality of Tax Sale ..... 4

    Proper Notice..... 5

    Redemption..... 7

**Actions Contesting Tax Sale or Collector’s Deed** ..... 7

    Distribution of Excess Proceeds from Tax Sale ..... 8

**Attorney’s Fees** ..... 10

    Miscellaneous Issues ..... 11

### **COVID-19 Executive Orders Affecting State and Local Government Operations and Elections – 2020-R-0112**

*(See section on Property Tax Assessment and Collection for modifications to non-judicial tax sale time periods)*

*Prepared by Connecticut Judicial Branch, Superior Court Operations,  
Judge Support Services, Law Library Services Unit*

[lawlibrarians@jud.ct.gov](mailto:lawlibrarians@jud.ct.gov)

These guides are provided with the understanding that they represent only a beginning to research. It is the responsibility of the person doing legal research to come to his or her own conclusions about the authoritativeness, reliability, validity, and currency of any resource cited in this research guide.

View our other research guides at  
<https://jud.ct.gov/lawlib/selfguides.htm>

This guide links to advance release slip opinions on the Connecticut Judicial Branch website and to case law hosted on Google Scholar.  
The online versions are for informational purposes only.

See also:

- [Collection of Delinquent Property Taxes in Connecticut](#)
- [Property Tax Appeals \(Municipal\)](#)

[Connecticut Judicial Branch Website Policies and Disclaimers](#)

<https://www.jud.ct.gov/policies.htm>

# Section 1: Municipal Tax Sales (Extra-Judicial)

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

## **SCOPE:**

Bibliographic resources related to extra-judicial tax sales of real property by municipalities.

## **DEFINITIONS:**

- **Tax Sale:** "The statutory method for collection of unpaid real estate taxes with which this case is concerned is the **public auction, or 'tax sale,'** pursuant to **General Statutes § 12-157**, as amended by Public Act No. 95-228 § 3. Unlike a statutory tax foreclosure; General Statutes §§ 12-181, 12-182; or a civil action in debt to collect the tax; General Statutes § 12-161; a public auction of real estate pursuant to General Statutes § 12-157 is entirely extra-judicial." [Pace Motor Lines, Inc. v. Biagiarelli](#), Superior Court, Judicial District of Fairfield at Bridgeport, No. 318117S (June 24, 1996) (17 Conn. L. Rptr. 77) (1996 Conn. Super. Lexis 1689) (1996 WL 383398).
- "Tax Collector Sales Procedure only permits sales to be conducted following repeated newspaper advertisements, public postings and multiple mailings to affected persons followed by a public auction with competitive bidding and sale to the highest bidder. Additional advertising and mailings to affected persons are also mandated following the sale and must contain detailed information about the outcome of the sale as well as the redemption date. And in Connecticut, unlike in other jurisdictions, **see** p. 21, fn. 12, *infra*, title to the property does not pass until after the sale has taken place and the redemption period has expired. Further, although there is no judicial oversight throughout the process, recourse to judicial review is **possible.**" [In re Jacobson](#), 523 B.R. 13, 21 (2014).
- "The power to sell land for delinquent taxes is strictly construed; the tax collector must substantially, if not strictly, comply **with all statutory provisions.**" [Associates Financial Services of America, Inc. v. Sorenson](#), 46 Conn. App. 721, 726-727, 700 A.2d 107, 111 (1997).

## **STATUTES:**

You can visit your local law library or search the most recent [statutes](#) and [public acts](#) on the Connecticut General Assembly website to confirm that you are using the most up-to-date statutes.

- Conn. Gen. Stat. (2019).
  - [Chapter 204](#). Local Levy and Collection of Taxes
    - § [12-140](#). Fees, costs and expenses of tax collectors and tax sales.
    - § [12-155](#). Demand and levy for the collection of taxes and water or sanitation charges.
    - § [12-157](#). Method of selling real estate for taxes.
    - § [12-158](#). Form of collector's deed. Liability of municipalities for breach of warranty.
    - § [12-159](#). Collector's deed as evidence. Irregularities.

§ [12-159a](#). Court orders in actions to contest **validity of collector's deed** or to enjoin tax sale.  
 § [12-159b](#). Time for action contesting validity of **collector's deed**.  
 § [12-167a](#). Affidavit concerning facts within personal knowledge of affiant re giving of notice of tax sales. Recording and indexing.

**LEGISLATIVE:**

[Office of Legislative Research](#) reports summarize and analyze the law in effect on the date of each **report's** publication. Current law may be different from what is discussed in the reports.

- Rute Pinho, *Acts Affecting Taxes*. Office of Legislative Research Report, [2015-R-0175](#). (July 30, 2015).
- John Rappa, *Municipal Authorization to Tax Property*. Office of Legislative Research Report, [2014-R-0037](#). (February 6, 2014).
- Christopher Reinhart, *State Marshals and Selling Residential Real Estate for Delinquent Taxes*. Office of Legislative Research Report, [2008-R-0518](#). (September 10, 2008).
- Kevin E. McCarthy, *Tax Sales of Abandoned Property*. Office of Legislative Research Report, [2000-R-0161](#). (February 3, 2000).

**FORMS:**

- Form of collector's deed.  
Conn. Gen. Stat. § [12-158](#)(a) (2019)
- Alias tax warrant.  
Conn. Gen. Stat. § [12-162](#)(b)(1) (2019)
- 22B [Am. Jur. Pleading & Practice Forms](#), *State and Local Taxation* (2011).
  - II. Property taxes
    - D. Sale of property for nonpayment of taxes
      - §§ 135-149. In general
      - §§ 150-167. Invalid sale or delivery of property
      - §§ 168-178. Redemption
- 16B [Am. Jur. Legal Forms](#), *State and Local Taxation* (2011).
  - III. Sale of land for nonpayment of taxes
    - §§ 238:15-238:21. In general
    - § 238.22. Tax deeds
    - §§ 238:23-238:25. Redemption

**CASES:**

---

***Constitutionality of Tax Sale***

---

- [Associates Financial Services of America, Inc. v. Sorenson](#), 46 Conn. App. 721, 726, 700 A.2d 107, 111 (1997). "We next address Ford Finance's claims that § 12-157 is unconstitutional because it fails to provide for a hearing or judicial review of the valuation and sale."

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

Although our appellate courts have never addressed the constitutionality of § 12-157, that issue has been raised and addressed in the Superior Court . . . In *Pace Motor Lines*, the court offered the following analysis that we find to be **persuasive**: “[T]he procedural due process requirement for a hearing applies only where a governmental body or official has engaged, or should have engaged, in factfinding. *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 344, 96 S. Ct. 893, 47 L. Ed. 2d 18 (1976) (procedural due process rules shaped by risk of error inherent in truth finding process). In a tax sale pursuant to General Statutes § 12-157, the tax collector does not find facts, other than the fact of nonpayment of taxes ...”

- *Pace Motor Lines, Inc. v. Biagiarelli*, Superior Court, Judicial District of Fairfield at Bridgeport, No. 318117S (June 24, 1996) (17 Conn. L. Rptr. 77) (1996 Conn. Super. Lexis 1689) (1996 WL 383398). “Even if the tax collector were to misuse his authority and to subvert the fairness of the tax sale, that would not render General Statutes § 12-157 violative of procedural due process. **Rather, the plaintiffs’** remedy would be a common law action, such as an action for a declaratory judgment and injunction. General Statutes § 52-483.; see also *Newton v. Schott*, 87 Conn. 142, 87 A. 271 (1913) (action to set aside tax levy and sale of real estate and deed); *Townsend Savings Bank v. Todd*, supra, 47 Conn. 190 (action for ejectment); see also *Curtis Building Co. v. Tunstall*, 36 Pa. Commw. 233, 236 n.2, 387 A.2d 1370 (1978) (if statutory remedy inadequate, action in equity to enjoin tax sale would lie; **statute not unconstitutional**).”

---

### **Proper Notice**

---

- *Hayden v. Gardner*, Superior Court, Judicial District of New London at New London, No. CV14-6023034-S (January 22, 2016) (2016 Conn. Super. Lexis 208) (2016 WL 673231). “**In this case** implicit in the execution of the **tax collector’s** deed is that statutory notice requirements pursuant to C.G.S. 12-157 have been followed. The plaintiff alleges that the statutory notice requirements were not followed. The plaintiff was entitled to rely upon the Town to follow the statutory framework. The principal benefit to the plaintiff from the following of the statutory procedures would be that the plaintiff would have had notice of the imminent intent of the Town to sell her property to satisfy the municipal tax obligations. Having **notice of the Town’s** intent the plaintiff would then have had a period of time to put her finances in order to **acquire the funds to satisfy the municipal tax obligation**.”

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

- [Cornelius v. Rosario](#), 138 Conn. App. 1, 16-17, 51 A. 3d 1144, 1153 (2012). "The plaintiff argued before the trial court that due process required the defendants to do more to ascertain his unrecorded interest in the property than to satisfy the requirements of § 12-157(a). The court disagreed **and concluded that the plaintiff's** interest was not reasonably ascertainable and, thus, he was not entitled to mail notice under § 12-157(a). Because of his own failure to record his deed, he was not an owner of record and, of course, did not pay taxes. The court noted that the plaintiff received constructive notice of the tax sale via publication in the Hartford Courant and a posting at city hall."
- [Rivera v. Tax Collector of Bridgeport](#), Superior Court, Judicial District of Fairfield at Bridgeport, No. CV96-0329949-S (March 29, 2000) (2000 Conn. Super. Lexis 802) (2000 WL 371488). "Considering the record as a whole, this court finds that probable cause exists to sustain **the validity of the plaintiff's** claim that the tax collector failed to give proper notice pursuant to § 12-157. Therefore, the motion for discharge of lis pendens is **denied.**"
- [Berger v. Fitzgerald](#), 55 Conn. App. 138, 149, 739 A.2d. 287, 293 (1999). "...§ 12-159 prevents Fitzgerald III from **questioning the plaintiffs'** title to the property. Section 12-159 provides in relevant **part:** 'Any deed, or the certified copy of the record of any deed, purporting to be executed by a tax collector ... shall be prima facie evidence of a valid and unencumbered title in the grantee to the premises.... No act done or omitted relative to the assessment or collection of a tax, including everything connected therewith ... shall in any way affect or impair ... the validity of such sale, unless the person contesting such validity shows that ... the collector neglected to mail to him the notice by law required, or to those with whom he is in privity of title, and who have a right to notice of such sale, and that he or they in fact did not know of such sale within one year [*now six months*] after it was made, provided such property was by law liable to be sold to **satisfy such tax....'** Thus, unless Fitzgerald III can show that (1) the tax collector failed to mail him notice of the sale and that he did not have actual notice of the sale one year [*now six months*] after it was made, or (2) that the property was not by law liable to be sold to satisfy the **tax, then the plaintiffs' proffer of the tax collector's deed is prima facie evidence of their valid and unencumbered title to the subject property.**"

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

---

## **Redemption**

---

- [In re Jacobson](#), 523 B.R. 13, (2014). “In connection with the Transfer, the Debtor was provided by law, see Conn. Gen. Stat. § 12-157(f), with a six-month ‘redemption’ period with respect to the Property.” (p. 16)

“The Tax Collector’s Deed was subject to cancellation, but **only** if the subject property was timely redeemed through payment of the amounts required by Conn. Gen. Stat. § 12-157(f). Accordingly, although at that time conveyance of the Property to A1Z7 did not deprive the Debtor of **all** right and interest in her Property, it did strip her of fee simple interest, and left her holding a bare redemption interest. However, because the Debtor thereafter failed to exercise her redemption rights by the date set forth in the notice sent to her in accordance with Conn. Gen. Stat. § 12-157(f), the Tax Collector’s Deed was recorded, and full title to the Property vested in A1Z7.” (p. 20)

---

## **Actions Contesting Tax Sale or Collector’s Deed**

---

- [Hayden v. Gardner](#), Superior Court, Judicial District of New London at New London, No. CV14-6023034-S (January 22, 2016) (2016 Conn. Super. Lexis 208) (2016 WL 673231). “This section [12-159a(a)] of the General Statutes has not been the subject of litigation which would clarify the necessary allegations necessary to support a successful **challenge to a tax collector’s** sale. What is clear from the review of this statute is that if the challenge is successful the court has the power to require the successful party to pay the underlying tax obligations and other expenses attendant to the sale as detailed in the statute. In this case the plaintiff asserts that the defendant has acted fraudulently and thus the court will look at what must alleged to establish an actionable claim of **fraud.**”
- [Sandra Caldrello, Trustee v. FDIC](#), Superior Court, Judicial District of New London at New London, No. 555134 (November 7, 2001) (2001 Conn. Super. Lexis 3154) (2001 WL 1468909). “After a suit becomes lis pendens, the statute of limitations will no longer run in favor of a pendente lite purchaser, or other person acquiring his rights during the pendency of the suit, regardless of the question whether he was or was not a party to the action, until after final judgment or decree has been rendered.’ 54 C.J.S., Lis Pendens § 39 (1987). If service on the FDIC was proper on May 23, 2000, and Republic subsequently acquired its interest in the property from the FDIC,

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

Republic would not be able to claim the benefit of the limitation period contained in General Statutes § 12-159b.”

- Republic Credit Corp. v. Caldrello, Superior Court, Judicial District of New London at New London, No. CV1016332 (September 11, 2000) (28 Conn. L. Rptr. 40) (2000 Conn. Super. Lexis 2404) (2000 WL 1409814). “**By statute**, therefore, there are only two grounds upon which a tax sale may be attacked. ‘[U]nless [the defendants] can show that (1) the tax collector failed to mail [them] notice of the sale and that [they] did not have actual notice of the sale [six months] after it was made, or (2) that the property was not by law liable to be sold to satisfy the tax, then the [plaintiff’s] proffer of the tax collector’s deed is prima facie evidence of [its] valid and unencumbered title to the subject property.’ Berger v. Fitzgerald, 55 Conn.App. 138, 149, 739 A.2d 287, cert. denied, 251 Conn. 922, 742 A.2d 358 (1999).”
- John Mulqueen & Associates, Inc. v. Miller et al., Superior Court, Judicial District of Danbury, No. 313890 (April 18, 1996) (1996 Conn. Super. Lexis 1008) (1996 WL 383321). “**Failure to record on time does not, however**, invalidate the transaction unless the plaintiff proves that notice of sale was not mailed to him and that he did not have actual knowledge of the sale. Clearly, the court believes that notice was sent to him and that he had actual knowledge. Connecticut General Statutes § 12-158, which is a savings clause, clearly corrected the technical error in recordation of the deed.”

---

### ***Distribution of Excess Proceeds from Tax Sale***

---

- A1Z7, LLC v. Mollo, Superior Court, Judicial District of Stamford-Norwalk at Stamford, No. FST-CV15-5015040-S (April 15, 2016) (62 Conn. L. Rptr. 151) (2016 Conn. Super. Lexis 804) (2016 WL 2602672). “**If anyone with a claim—‘any person’—** could make a claim against these proceeds, then what is the purpose of the earlier sentence authorizing claims **by** ‘the delinquent taxpayer, any mortgagee, lien holder or other encumbrancer ... ?’ The first sentence identifies the parties who may file an application, the subsequent sentence addresses how such an application is to be filed.

This also is consistent with the purpose of the statute. Parties with a perfected claim against the property no longer have the same security interest in the property, as the defendant-debtor no longer owns the property. In effect, the security against which a security interest

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

previously existed has been liquidated, and the statute converts a claim against the property into a claim against the surplus funds resulting from the sale of the property. That is consistent with the statutory requirement that any claimant have a perfected ('choate') lien or interest. Instead of a lien or security interest that potentially could be the subject of a foreclosure action, a claimant now has a summary procedure for obtaining the value of its claim out of the cash that has been substituted for the real estate that previously had been security for a claim.

Clearly, the unpaid amount due under a lease, the amount paid for dumpsters to haul away trash, etc., have no relationship to the purpose of the statute. These are not 'choate' claims, they were not perfected prior to a trial **of this matter."**

- Town of Columbia v. Lake Columbia, LLC et al, Superior Court, Judicial District of Tolland at Rockville, No. CV14-5005820-S (August 27, 2014) (2014 Conn. Super. Lexis 2107) (2014 WL 4921576). "It would be unjust for the sole applicant in this case, who performed his end of the bargain, to be barred from collecting moneys owed to him in accordance with his agreement with the record owner of the property. **Therefore, given the applicant's** contributions to the property, as well as the fact that the record owner of the property has not been in communication and has failed to hold up her end of the bargain, this court finds that the applicant also qualifies as an equitable lienholder whose interest in such property is affected by the tax sale of the property, pursuant to General Statutes (Rev. to 2013) § 12-157(i)(2)."
- Messina v. MT. Olive Towers, Superior Court, Judicial District of Waterbury at Waterbury, Docket No. CV04-4002106-S (June 28, 2005) (2005 Conn. Super. Lexis 1691) (2005 WL 1805604). "**Connecticut General Statutes** Section 12-157(d) authorizes a municipal tax collector to **'retain the services of auctioneers and other persons** to assist the tax collector in the conduct of the sale and the cost of such persons paid for their services shall be added **to the taxes due from the delinquent taxpayer.'** . . . Connecticut General Statutes Sections 12-140 and 12-157 provide that all fees, including those of an auctioneer, are **to be paid from the proceeds of the tax sale."**
- AR International Properties v. Town of Litchfield, Superior Court, Judicial District of Litchfield at Litchfield, No. CV04-0092875-S (September 22, 2004) (2004 Conn. Super. Lexis 2693) (2004 WL 2284364). "This court in interpreting General Statute § 12-157(i)(2) finds that it is not ambiguous. The court finds that the two sentences which are the subject of this controversy are separate and

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

distinct. The court finds the first sentence which enumerates the parties who may make application and the **second sentence which starts with 'Any person'** are not interrelated. The basis for the court's finding is that if the legislature intended only certain named parties to have the right to claim the excess funds there is no reason for the second sentence. In addition, the sentence which allows any person to make a claim for the money specifically allows the court to exercise its equitable powers in determining a party's interest. If the legislature intended to limit who could make an application they could have simply said the following parties only may **make application for the excess funds."**

- [Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Caldrello](#), 79 Conn. App. 384, 830 A.2d 767, 773, 776 (2003). **"Although the defendants claim that the statute does not set forth any particular form or manner for such an application, that assertion is contrary to the language of the statute. Section 12-157 sets forth three requirements that must be satisfied by a party attempting to recover excess tax sale proceeds: (1) the party must file an application with the court, (2) the application must be filed within ninety days of the date the tax collector paid the moneys to the court and (3) the applicant must serve notice of the application in the same manner as to commence a civil action on all persons having an interest of record in such property."** (p. 389)

"Section 12-157(i)(2) does not require that an applicant **for the proceeds be a holder in due course."** (p. 396)

---

### **Attorney's Fees**

---

- [Cornelius v. Rosario](#), 167 Conn. App. 120, 132, 143 A. 3d 611, 618 (2016). **"In light of the strong presumption against federal preemption of state and local legislation, particularly in areas traditionally occupied by the states, we decline to find that the recovery of attorney's fees under § 12-140 is preempted by the application of § 1988. See [Fair Assessment in Real Estate Assn., Inc. v. McNary](#), 454 U.S. 100, 115-16, 102 S.Ct. 177, 70 L.Ed.2d 271 (1981) (holding that taxpayers are barred from asserting § 1983 actions against validity of state tax systems in federal court when state law furnishes adequate legal remedy and stating: 'The recovery of damages under the Civil Rights Act first requires a declaration or determination of the unconstitutionality of a state tax scheme that would halt its operation.'"**

Once you have identified useful cases, it is important to update the cases before you rely on them. Updating case law means checking to see if the cases are still good law. You can [contact your local law librarian](#) to learn about the tools available to you to update cases.

---

### **Miscellaneous Issues**

---

- [JJT & M, Inc. v. Town of Oxford](#), Superior Court, Judicial District of Ansonia-Milford at Milford, No. CV13-6013721-S (January 31, 2014) (57 Conn. L. Rptr. 569) (2014 WL 783696) (2014 Conn. Super. Lexis 213). "In the present case, the central underlying allegations of the third count are that the tax collector engaged in a tax fraud scheme that included the manipulation and alteration of real estate tax assessments, the failure to credit property owners for payments submitted in payment of their real estate tax bills, and/or the theft of taxpayer funds, and as a result, this tax fraud scheme resulted in real estate taxes that were **'inflated, false, and fraudulent.'** See Amended Complaint (#103) count 3, paras. 5-7. As these alleged acts go to whether the taxes placed upon the property were proper rather than whether it could be sold under applicable laws to satisfy the taxes in question, they are legally insufficient to constitute a basis on which to **challenge the tax deed at issue.**"
- [In re Jacobson](#), 523 B.R. 13, 24 (2014). "For the reasons stated herein the Court has concluded and determines that the price paid by A1Z7 for the purchase of the Debtor's Property is entitled to a conclusive presumption of **'reasonably equivalent value'** within the meaning of **Bankruptcy Code § 548(a)(1)(B)(i).**"
- [Singh v. City Of Hartford](#), 116 Conn. App. 50, 52, 974 A.2d 810, 811-812 (2009). ". . . [T]he plaintiff filed a complaint in Superior Court in which he alleged that at the time of the transfer of the property on December 13, 2002, the defendant was aware that the property contained asbestos and other hazardous material. Furthermore, he alleged, the defendant's failure to disclose to the plaintiff that the property contained asbestos and other hazardous material required him to remove and to abate those materials at a considerable cost to him and that their presence also reduced the **property's** value substantially. As a result, the plaintiff sought damages. On March 3, 2006, the defendant filed an answer that included a special defense alleging that the plaintiff was estopped from claiming any liability on the part of the defendant that resulted from the transfer **of the property because of the 'as is' clause included in the contract for sale.**"
- [Faught v. Edgewood Corners, Inc.](#), 63 Conn. App. 164, 175, 772 A.2d. 1142, 1149 (2001). "Our legislature, however, in the context of a tax sale, has evidenced that an easement appurtenant does not fall within the general

category of encumbrances extinguished by the sale. Section 12-159 further provides in relevant part that title conveyed in a tax sale is 'encumbered only by the lien of taxes ... easements and similar interests appurtenant to other properties not thereby conveyed....' **General Statutes § 12-159.**"

**WEST KEY NUMBERS:**

- **Taxation**  
 2835-2847. Summary Remedies and Actions.  
 2900-2997. Sale of Land for Nonpayment of Tax.  
 3000-3053. Redemption From Tax Sale.  
 3060-3082. Title and Rights of Purchaser at Tax Sale.

**ENCYCLOPEDIAS:**

- 72 [Am Jur 2d State and Local Taxation](#) (2012).  
 §§ 803-960. Sale of Land for Nonpayment of Taxes.
- 85 [C.J.S. Taxation](#) (2010).  
 §§ 1221-1353. Sale of Land for Delinquent Taxes.
- Robert L. Herrick, J.D., *Proof of Circumstances Justifying the Setting Aside of Tax Sales of Real Property*, 28 [POF3d](#) 439 (1994).

**TEXTS & TREATISES:**

You can click on the links provided to see which law libraries own the title you are interested in, or visit our [catalog](#) directly to search for more treatises.

- 2 Denis R. Caron and Geoffrey K. Milne, [Connecticut Foreclosures: An Attorney's Manual of Practice and Procedure](#), 9<sup>th</sup> ed. (2019).  
 Chapter 29. Tax Collector Sales  
   § 29-3. The Notice of Sale Requirements  
     § 29-3: 1. Constitutionality Addressed  
     § 29-3: 2. The First Notice of Sale  
       § 29-3: 2.1. Disseminating the Notice  
     § 29-3: 3. The Second Notice of Sale  
   § 29-4. The Sale  
   § 29-5. The Post-Sale Notice  
   § 29-6. **The Tax Collector's Deed**  
     § 29-6: 1. The Status of Title  
     § 29-6: 2. The Affidavit  
     § 29-6: 3. The Warranty Covenants  
   § 29-7. Redemption  
     § 29-7: 1. The Redemption Process  
       § 29-7: 1.1. The Redemption Amount  
       § 29-7: 1.2. To Whom Paid  
       § 29-7: 1.3. The Certificate of Satisfaction  
   § 29-8. Excess Proceeds  
     § 29-8: 1. When There Is a Redemption  
     § 29-8: 2. When There is No Redemption  
   § 29-9. Challenging Validity of Deed  
   § 29-10. Federal Tax Liens  
   § 29-11. New Standards of Title Relating to Tax Collector Sales

- 16 McQuillin, [The Law of Municipal Corporations](#), 3d ed. rev. (2013).  
Chapter 44. Taxation  
XIV Tax Liens  
§§ 44: 199-44: 220. Sale for Nonpayment of Taxes
- 5 Richard Powell, [The Law of Real Property](#) (2018).  
Chapter 39. Tax Liens  
§ 39.04. Enforcement of State and Local Land Liens  
[4] The Tax Sale  
[5] Redemption  
[6] Tax Deeds  
[7] Invalidating Tax Titles
- David F. Sherwood, [LexisNexis Tax Practice Insights: Connecticut](#), 2d ed. (2010).  
The Redeeming Party in a Tax Sale Pays Simple, Not Compound Interest on the Sale Price Plus the Overdue Taxes, Interest and Costs (Lexis CT Tax P.I. 2, 992)
- John Rao et al, [Foreclosures and Mortgage Servicing](#), 5th ed., National Consumer Law Center  
Chapter 17. Tax Liens and Tax Foreclosures  
§ 17.1. An Overview of the Process  
§ 17.2. Real Property Taxation Process  
§ 17.3. Preventing Property Tax Foreclosures  
§ 17.4. Redemption Following Sale  
§ 17.5. Fraud by Tax Sale Speculators  
§ 17.6. Private Collection and Enforcement of Tax Liens
- [Connecticut Bar Association Standards of Title](#) (1999, Rev. to November 11, 2013)  
Chapter 29. Tax Collector Sales  
**Standard 29.1. Effect of Tax Collector’s Deed** Given Pursuant to Sale Occurring After July 6, 1995  
**Standard 29.2. Effect of Tax Collector’s Deed** Given Pursuant to Sale Occurring Before July 6, 1995  
Standard 29.3. Effect of a Tax Collector’s Deed on a Federal Tax Lien  
Standard 29.4. Effect of Redemption in a Tax Collector Sale
- Lieberman, Alan E. & Schatz, Louis B., *Recent Connecticut Tax Law Developments*, 89 [Connecticut Bar Journal](#) 4, p. 245, 274-275 (2016).
- Cohen, Adam J., *Revisions to Connecticut’s Municipal Revenue Collection Statutes*, 24 [Connecticut Lawyer](#) no. 2, pp. 26-27 (September 2013).

**LAW REVIEWS:**

Public access to law review databases is available on-site at each of our [law libraries](#).

- Peterson, Lowell Lee, *The Levy and Sale of Tax Warrants in Connecticut: Clarification*, 10 [Connecticut Real Estate Law Journal](#) no. 4, pp. 67-68 (November/December 1992).
- Peterson, Lowell Lee, *The Levy and Sale of Tax Warrants in Connecticut*, 10 [Connecticut Real Estate Law Journal](#) no. 3, pp. 37-45 (September/October 1992).