

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 8

August 22, 2017

310 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

In re Elianah T.-T., 326 C 614 . . . . .	76
<i>Neglect; whether trial court properly granted petitioner Commissioner of Children and Families permission to vaccinate respondent parents' minor children over religious objection; whether petitioner has authority to authorize vaccination of children committed to temporary custody pursuant to statute (§ 17a-10 [c]); doctrine of ejusdem generis, discussed.</i>	
Kellogg v. Middlesex Mutual Assurance Co., 326 C 638 . . . . .	100
<i>Arbitration; application to vacate arbitration award; property insured under restorationist insurance policy; appeal from trial court's granting of application to vacate award pursuant to governing statute (§ 52-418); whether trial court correctly concluded that appraisal panel's failure to award money for certain losses claimed by plaintiff prejudiced plaintiff's substantial monetary rights and warranted granting of application to vacate under § 52-418 (a) (3); whether trial court correctly concluded that panel's calculation of depreciation in restorationist insurance policy was obvious error, that panel ignored governing law, and that panel's decision evidenced manifest disregard of nature and terms of that policy, and, therefore, that plaintiff sustained her burden under § 52-418 (a) (4); whether trial court correctly interpreted decision in Northrop v. Allstate Ins. Co. (247 Conn. 242); manifest disregard of law as ground for vacating arbitration award, discussed.</i>	
Munn v. Hotchkiss School, 326 C 540. . . . .	2
<i>Negligence; claim that defendant school had been negligent in failing to warn plaintiff student and her parents of risk of exposure to tick-borne encephalitis in connection with school sponsored educational trip to China, and in failing to ensure that plaintiff took protective measures against insect bites to prevent contracting that disease; certified questions from Second Circuit Court of Appeals as to whether Connecticut public policy supported imposing duty on school to warn about or to protect against foreseeable risk of serious insect-borne disease when it organized trip abroad, and whether damages award warranted remittitur; whether normal expectations of participants in school sponsored trip abroad supported imposition of duty on defendant to warn about and to protect against serious insect-borne diseases; claim that recognizing duty would have chilling effect on educational travel and will lead to increased litigation; claim that rarity of tick-borne encephalitis precluded finding that defendant had duty to warn or to protect.</i>	
Williams v. General Nutrition Centers, Inc., 326 C 651 . . . . .	113
<i>Wage laws and regulations; calculation of overtime pay for employees who receive commissions in addition to base pay; certified question from United States District Court for District of Connecticut; whether defendants could use fluctuating work-week method to calculate overtime pay under state wage laws and regulations; interpretation of state wage law (§ 31-76c) and state wage regulation (§ 31-62-D4).</i>	
Volume 326 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	131

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Commissioner of Social Services v. Zarnetski, 175 CA 632 . . . . .	2A
<i>Child support; whether trial court improperly affirmed order of family support magistrate dismissing petition for child support filed by plaintiff Commissioner of Social Services on behalf of mother of minor child for failure to provide copy of acknowledgment of paternity that was signed by defendant father in Massachu-</i>	

(continued on next page)

setts; whether plaintiff was required, pursuant to relevant statutory (§§ 46b-172 and 46b-215) provisions, to produce Massachusetts acknowledgement of paternity for magistrate to proceed on support petition; whether out-of-state acknowledgment is given same full faith and credit as one executed in Connecticut; whether trial court acted in contravention of plain and unambiguous language of §§ 46b-172 and 46b-215 when it found that magistrate properly dismissed support petition for failure to provide copy of Massachusetts acknowledgment; whether public policy violated by magistrate and trial court requiring plaintiff to submit acknowledgment of paternity when paternity was not at issue.

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. v. Herman, 175 CA 662 . . . . . 32A

Foreign judgment; application for order in aid of execution of foreign judgment; trusts; application for turnover order; personal jurisdiction; in rem jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly exercised personal jurisdiction over defendant because he had no significant contacts with Connecticut and mere presence of defendant's broker in state was insufficient to confer jurisdiction; claim that trial court's turnover order improperly deviated from its oral ruling granting plaintiff's application for turnover order; whether turnover order should have been directed specifically to broker's Stamford office instead of to broker's office in general and should have expressly limited execution to assets in subject trust account.

Procaccini v. Lawrence & Memorial Hospital, Inc., 175 CA 692. . . . . 62A

Medical malpractice; claim that defendant was vicariously liable for medical malpractice of physician in treating decedent for suspected drug overdose where physician failed to keep decedent under medical monitoring for twenty-four hour period; whether there was sufficient evidence supporting jury's finding that defendant's negligence caused decedent's death; whether jury had before it sufficient evidence from which it could have inferred, without resorting to speculation, that decedent had consumed fatal dose of methadone before she was brought to hospital emergency department; credibility of witnesses; conflicting expert testimony; claim that it was improper for jury to consider testimony of plaintiff's expert on standard of care concerning issue of causation; claim that because plaintiff failed to present evidence demonstrating that decedent would have been admitted to hospital had physician not discharged decedent from emergency department, jury could not reasonably have found that defendant caused decedent's death; whether, to prove causation, plaintiff needed to show only that decedent could have been monitored sufficiently for twenty-four hours; whether trial court abused discretion in refusing to set aside jury's award of damages for destruction of decedent's capacity to carry on and enjoy life's activities; whether plaintiff presented sufficient evidence of decedent's life expectancy.

Renaissance Management Co. v. Barnes, 175 CA 681. . . . . 51A

Summary process; retaliatory eviction; summary judgment; mootness; capable of repetition, yet evading review exception to mootness doctrine; whether parties satisfied first prong of capable of repetition, yet evading review exception to mootness doctrine pertaining to length of challenged action; whether this court or our Supreme Court would be able to resolve in later appeal whether fitness and

(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.

*habitability requirements enunciated in Visco v. Cody (16 Conn. App. 444), relating to meaning of repairs as set forth in retaliatory eviction statute (§ 47a-20 [3]), were applicable to finding of municipal code violations pursuant to § 47a-20 (2); whether failure of this court to determine issue would give rise to prejudicial collateral consequences to landlords in future summary process cases.*

Rockstone Capital, LLC v. Sanzo, 175 CA 770 . . . . . 140A

*Foreclosure; homestead exemption statute (§ 52-352b [t]); amendment of complaint to foreclose mortgage instead of judgment liens; jurisdiction to hear appealable final judgment; claim that trial court improperly denied foreclosure of plaintiff's mortgage and allowed defendants to assert homestead exemption to consensual lien and judgment liens no longer part of action; claim that trial court erred in rendering judgment of foreclosure on judgment liens because plaintiff amended its complaint to seek foreclosure solely on mortgage.*

State v. Soto, 175 CA 739 . . . . . 109A

*Criminal possession of pistol; risk of injury to child; reviewability of claim; claim that jury's verdict was against weight of evidence; whether this court could review defendant's claim that evidence against him was so weak as to raise substantial question regarding reliability of verdict when defendant failed to file motion to set aside verdict and for new trial; sufficiency of evidence claims and weight of evidence claims, distinguished and discussed.*

State v. Walton, 175 CA 642 . . . . . 12A

*Robbery first degree; larceny second degree; assault on elderly person third degree; prosecutorial impropriety; claim that certain comments made by prosecutor during rebuttal closing argument constituted improper vouching and misstatements of law; whether subject comments were proper request for jurors to use common sense and to draw reasonable inferences from evidence in assessing credibility of witnesses.*

TD Bank, N.A. v. Salce, 175 CA 757. . . . . 127A

*Promissory note; personal jurisdiction; promissory estoppel; claim that trial court erred in denying defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction due to insufficient service of process as required by statute (§ 52-59b [c]); claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of plaintiff because defendant's special defense of promissory estoppel, which alleged that plaintiff was estopped from prosecuting action due to its failure or refusal to issue promised documents after agreeing to note modification, raised genuine issue of material fact.*

Windsor Federal Savings & Loan Assn. v. Reliable Mechanical Contractors, LLC, 175 CA 651 . . . . . 21A

*Contracts; whether individual defendant, who was no longer defendant to complaint when trial court rendered final judgment on complaint, was aggrieved and had standing to appeal from final judgment on complaint; whether this court lacked jurisdiction for lack of final judgment over appeal challenging trial court's dismissal of counterclaim; whether trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment; whether defendant raised genuine issue of material fact as to whether guarantee was signed by defendant; whether trial court improperly resolved contested fact in granting motion for summary judgment; whether claim that trial court improperly dismissed counterclaim on ground that it was barred by statute of limitations was moot where there still existed another unchallenged ground on which trial court based judgment.*

Volume 175 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 161A

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Small Claims Decentralization . . . . . 1B