

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 4

July 25, 2017

462 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

James E. v. Commissioner of Correction, 326 C 388	60
<i>Habeas corpus; assault of elderly person first degree; reckless endangerment first degree; risk of injury to child; whether habeas court properly dismissed writ of habeas corpus for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that amendment to statute (§ 54-125a [b] [2]) that repealed provision advancing certain inmates' parole eligibility dates by earned risk reduction credit violated ex post facto clause of federal constitution; claim that proper comparison for ex post facto analysis is between provision in effect at time of sentencing and subsequently enacted provision; facts of Lynce v. Mathis (519 U.S. 433), distinguished; decision and reasoning in Perez v. Commissioner of Correction (326 Conn. 357), controlling.</i>	
Machado v. Taylor, 326 C 396	68
<i>Motor vehicle negligence action; statutory provision (§ 52-556) providing injured motorist right of action against state for injuries resulting from negligent operation of state owned and insured motor vehicle by state employee; motion for judgment of dismissal; claim that action should be dismissed for plaintiff's failure to offer evidence at trial to establish vehicle was insured by state, placing claim outside purview of waiver of sovereign immunity; rules of practice (§§ 10-30 [a] [1] and 15-8), distinguished; motion to open evidence; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss alleging lack of subject matter jurisdiction on basis of delay and doctrine of laches.</i>	
Perez v. Commissioner of Correction, 326 C 357	29
<i>Habeas corpus; manslaughter first degree with firearm; carrying pistol without permit; whether 2013 amendments (P.A. 13-3 and P.A. 13-247) to statute ([Rev. to 2013] § 54-125a) eliminating earned risk reduction credit from calculation of violent offender's parole eligibility date, when such credit was not allowed at time that offense was committed, and eliminating requirement of parole hearing, violated petitioner's right to due process under federal and state constitutions and right to personal liberty pursuant to state constitution; whether retroactive application to petitioner of 2013 amendments, when he committed offense and was sentenced prior to amendments' effective date, violated ex post facto clause of federal constitution; claim that, in conducting ex post facto inquiry, habeas court was not limited to comparing challenged statute with statute in effect at time that offense was committed but may consider statute in effect at time of plea and sentencing; claim that application of 2013 amendment to parole eligibility provision of § 54-125a (b) (2) by Board of Pardons and Paroles violated doctrine of separation of powers in that it converted legislatively determined parole eligible offense into offense which, by virtue of executive action, was rendered parole ineligible; claim that 2013 amendment, as applied to petitioner, violated equal protection clause of federal constitution; claim that statute (§ 18-98e), pursuant to which respondent Commissioner of Correction was vested with discretion to award risk reduction credit toward reduction of inmate's sentence, facially violated equal protection clause; claim that proper interpretation of 2013 amendments would limit application of those provisions to those inmates who began serving sentences after effective date of provisions.</i>	
State v. Houghtaling, 326 C 330	2
<i>Possession of marijuana with intent to sell; possession of more than four ounces of marijuana; motion to suppress; conditional plea of nolo contendere; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that defendant</i>	

(continued on next page)

lacked standing to challenge warrantless search of property because he lacked subjective expectation of privacy; proper standard for determining whether defendant has subjective expectation of privacy in property subject to warrantless search, discussed; claim that defendant's confession to police was fruit of unlawful stop of defendant in his vehicle and his subsequent warrantless arrest; whether police had reasonable and articulable suspicion that defendant was involved in marijuana grow operation on property; whether police had probable cause to arrest defendant after stop of his vehicle; State v. Boyd (57 Conn. App. 176), to extent that it requires defendant, in order to establish subjective expectation of privacy, to show certain facts pertaining to his relationship with property and that he maintained property in private manner, overruled.

Volume 326 Cumulative Table of Cases 79

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of New York, Trustee v. Savvidis, 174 CA 843 5A
Foreclosure; bankruptcy; motion to reenter judgment of strict foreclosure and to reset law days; claim that trial court improperly relied on certain affidavit in calculating outstanding debt; whether defendants demonstrated that they were substantially prejudiced by court's decision; whether court abused its discretion in declining to conduct evidentiary hearing on issue of its reliance on subject affidavit in calculating outstanding debt.

DiGiuseppe v. DiGiuseppe, 174 CA 855. 17A
Dissolution of marriage; motion for contempt; reviewability of claim that trial court erred in not finding latent ambiguity in provision of separation agreement concerning college expenses; reviewability of claim that trial court erred in determining that defendant was responsible for all of children's college expenses; failure to distinctly raise claim at trial.

Hampton v. Commissioner of Correction, 174 CA 867 29A
Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner was prejudiced by trial counsel's deficient performance in failing to object to trial court's improper jury instructions that petitioner could be convicted as principal or accessory with respect to count of information that charged petitioner as accessory; claim that defense counsel's deficient performance permitted jury to return nonunanimous verdict of guilty in that it was unclear whether jury found petitioner guilty as principal or accessory; whether habeas court properly determined that precise harm that petitioner asserted by defense counsel's deficient performance was not so significant that there was reasonable probability that outcome of trial with respect to count at issue would have been different.

Marciano v. Olde Oak Village Condominium Assn., Inc., 174 CA 851. 13A
Negligence; premises liability; claim that trial court erroneously concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact that defendant condominium association did not have possession and control over area where plaintiff unit owner fell; whether plaintiff was deemed to have admitted that area where she fell was her

(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.

responsibility to maintain by failing to respond to defendant's requests for admissions.

Singh v. CVS, 174 CA 841. 3A
Workers' compensation; whether plaintiff was entitled to benefits for total incapacity from compensable injury under applicable statute (§ 31-307).

State v. Purcell (replacement pages), 174 CA 407-408 v
 Volume 174 Cumulative Table of Cases 49A

Cadle Co. v. Ogalin, 175 CA 1 59A
Summary judgment; action to enforce judgment; whether trial court improperly granted motion to strike second special defense alleging that action was duplicative, unfair, inequitable, vexatious and oppressive; whether allegation of nonpayment is sufficient reason for initiating action; whether defendant established claim that action was unfair and duplicative due to fact that active collection proceedings remained pending before trial court; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment; whether trial court properly determined that special defense of laches was equitable defense and not applicable to action for monetary damages that was filed within relevant statute of limitations (§ 52-598); whether defendant alleged facts to create genuine issue of material fact as to whether he was prejudiced by any delay in enforcement; claim that trial court improperly awarded postjudgment interest; failure to specifically plead issue of res judicata as special defense; reviewability of claim raised for first time on appeal.

Hosein v. Edman, 175 CA 13. 69A
Negligence; personal injury; claim that trial court erred in discrediting and effectively precluding testimony of accident reconstructionist witness without affording plaintiff evidentiary hearing; whether it was within province of trial court, as trier of fact, to decide what weight, if any, to afford testimony of expert witness.

Hynes v. Jones, 175 CA 80 136A
Probate; whether Superior Court properly dismissed appeal from Probate Court's denial of motion to dismiss guardianship proceedings; claim that Probate Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to statute (§ 45a-629 [a]); claim that the Superior Court improperly determined that minor child was resident of probate district when she became entitled to share of award from victim compensation fund.

State v. Franklin, 175 CA 22 78A
Murder; attempt to commit robbery in first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; criminal possession of firearm; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of murder; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of criminal possession of firearm; claim that trial court abused discretion when it admitted certain uncharged misconduct evidence; claim that prosecutor's allegedly improper comments during closing argument to jury violated defendant's right to fair trial.

Village Mortgage Co. v. Veneziano, 175 CA 59. 115A
Injunction; alleged misappropriation of corporate funds through conversion, statutory theft, and embezzlement; statute of limitations; claim that trial court's factual findings were clearly erroneous; reviewability of claims challenging discovery rulings of trial court; credibility determinations; whether trial court improperly denied motion for discovery of information; claim that trial court improperly failed to conclude that plaintiff intentionally spoliated evidence or engaged in discovery misconduct; claim that trial court improperly concluded that three year statute of limitations (§ 52-577) was not tolled by doctrine of fraudulent concealment; claim that knowledge of corporation can only be imputed through board of directors.

Volume 175 Cumulative Table of Cases 165A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

CONNECTICUT CODE OF EVIDENCE

Revisions to the Connecticut Code of Evidence Being Considered by the Supreme Court 1C

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Housing, Department of 1D

MISCELLANEOUS

Small Claims Decentralization 1E
