

174 Conn. App. 401

JULY, 2017

407

State v. Purcell

engaged in a discussion with the victim about his sexuality.⁵ The victim's father asked if the victim liked girls or boys, to which the victim replied that he liked girls. The victim's father explained that, in the eyes of the Catholic Church, it is bad and a sin to like boys and that sex should occur between a man and a woman. The victim then acknowledged that he had started to like and think about boys but maintained, "[i]t's not my fault." The victim told his father that the defendant "has been having sex with me."

The following Monday, September 30, 2013, after the victim left for school, the victim's parents went to the police station to report his allegation. While at the police station, the victim's parents received a phone call from the victim's school social worker informing them that the victim told him that his "Uncle Robert" was having sex with him.

The defendant was subsequently arrested on the basis of the victim's allegations. The operative long form information charged the defendant with seven offenses in connection with four separate incidents. Relative to the August, 2010 incident, the defendant was charged with risk of injury to a child in violation of § 53-21 (a) (1). Relative to the December, 2011 incident, the defendant was charged with sexual assault in the first degree in violation of § 53a-70 (a) (1) and risk of injury to a child in violation of § 53-21 (a) (2). Relative to an incident that allegedly occurred in April, 2012, the defendant was charged with sexual assault in the second degree in violation of § 53a-71 (a) (1) and risk of

⁵ At trial, the victim's father maintained that he spoke to the victim about his sexuality because his wife found pictures of penises on the victim's Nintendo DS. In his statement to the police on September 30, 2013, however, he stated that he spoke to the victim about his sexuality because his wife found pictures of his stomach on the victim's Nintendo DS and the victim was always rubbing and touching his stomach. The victim's father did not mention in his police statement that his wife had found pictures of penises on the victim's Nintendo DS.

NOTE: These pages (174 Conn. App. 407 and 408) are in replacement of the same numbered pages that appear in the Connecticut Law Journal of 4 July 2017.

408

JULY, 2017

174 Conn. App. 401

State v. Purcell

injury to a child in violation of § 53-21 (a) (2). Finally, relative to the August, 2013 incident, the defendant was charged with sexual assault in the second degree in violation of § 53a-71 (a) (1) and risk of injury to a child in violation of § 53-21 (a) (2).

After a trial, a jury found the defendant guilty of the risk of injury counts with respect to the August, 2010, the December, 2011, and the August, 2013 incidents. The jury found the defendant not guilty of all counts of sexual assault and not guilty of the risk of injury count relative to the alleged incident in April, 2012. The defendant was sentenced to a total effective term of sixteen years of imprisonment, execution suspended after nine years, and ten years of probation. This appeal followed. Additional facts will be set forth as necessary.

I

We begin with the defendant's claims pertaining to the PTSD testimony. The defendant claims that the PTSD testimony was hearsay and constituted a harmful nonconstitutional evidentiary error, and, therefore, the court abused its discretion by denying his motion for a mistrial. In particular, the defendant argues that the PTSD testimony "constituted an [improper] endorsement or confirmation of [the victim's] credibility—and the defendant's guilt," and improperly embraced an ultimate issue in the case, i.e., whether some or all of the events the victim described actually happened, thereby causing his PTSD. The defendant argues that the prejudicial nature of this evidence was beyond the curative powers of the court because the PTSD diagnosis related to the victim's credibility, which was crucial to a successful prosecution because the state's case lacked physical evidence of sexual assault and portions of the victim's testimony "were highly implausible." The state responds that the court's "clear and forceful curative instructions . . . expressly broke any link between the