

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 12 September 19, 2017 238 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Nelson v. Commissioner of Correction, 326 C 772	2
<i>Habeas corpus; kidnapping first degree; burglary first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery first degree; assault first degree; claim of ineffective assistance of criminal trial counsel; motion to dismiss habeas petition; claim by respondent Commissioner of Correction that habeas action was barred by terms of stipulated judgment; whether habeas court, in ruling on motion to dismiss, was required to consider petitioner's claim challenging validity of stipulated judgment raised for first time in petitioner's memorandum of law filed with his objection to motion to dismiss; claim that habeas rights not subject to waiver by petitioner.</i>	
Volume 326 Cumulative Table of Cases	19

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Aldin Associates Ltd. Partnership v. Hess Corp., 176 CA 461	43A
<i>Contracts; claim that defendant franchisor violated Connecticut Petroleum Product Franchise Act (§ 42-133j et seq.) and Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.), and breached implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; whether trial court improperly sustained objection to claim for jury trial; whether trial court erroneously found that plaintiff failed to prove damages with sufficient degree of certainty; whether plaintiff failed to prove by preponderance of evidence that it did not intend to be bound by jury waiver provisions in franchise agreements; whether jury trial waivers were void under Connecticut Petroleum Product Franchise Act; claim that trial court abused discretion by failing to overrule objection to jury trial claim on ground that objection was untimely; whether trial court's finding that plaintiff failed to provide evidence needed to compute damages with reasonable certainty was clearly erroneous; whether trial court improperly conflated question of damages with question of causation; whether trial court's finding that CUTPA claim failed because plaintiff did not present sufficient evidence of ascertainable loss was clearly erroneous.</i>	
Amica Mutual Ins. Co. v. Piquette, 176 CA 559	141A
<i>Declaratory judgment; action to determine scope of coverage provided under automobile insurance policy; whether wife's loss of consortium claim should be considered separately from husband's bodily injury claim for purposes of per person limitation in policy; claim that policy language was ambiguous and required that policy be construed against plaintiff; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment; whether trial court properly applied Izzo v. Colonial Penn Ins. Co. (203 Conn. 305), to facts of present case.</i>	
Fuller v. Baldino, 176 CA 451	33A
<i>Third party petition for visitation; motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's visitation petition for lack of subject matter jurisdiction without evidentiary hearing; whether court properly determined that petition failed to sufficiently allege that denial of visitation would subject child to real and significant harm.</i>	
Gostyla v. Chambers, 176 CA 506	88A
<i>Negligence; whether trial court abused discretion in admitting expert testimony concerning causation; whether biomechanical engineer expert witness was qualified to testify as to whether motor vehicle collision caused plaintiff's injuries;</i>	

(continued on next page)

- whether record was adequate to determine whether evidentiary impropriety was harmful.*
- Presidential Village, LLC v. Perkins, 176 CA 493 75A
Summary process; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly dismissed summary process action on ground that federal pretermination notice was defective, depriving court of subject matter jurisdiction over action; whether pretermination notice sufficiently complied with applicable federal regulations and requirements (24 C.F.R. §§ 247.3 and 247.4) governing termination of federally subsidized tenancy based on nonpayment of rent; whether pretermination notice provided adequate notice of termination of tenancy; whether notice set forth ground of termination with enough specificity to enable defendant to prepare defense to summary process action.
- St. Joseph's High School, Inc. v. Planning & Zoning Commission, 176 CA 570 152A
Zoning; whether trial court improperly sustained appeal in part from decision of defendant planning and zoning commission denying application for special permit to install lighting on school property; whether court applied improper legal standard in reviewing commission's decision on special permit application and determining that general standards contained in town's zoning regulations could not serve as sole basis for denying special permit application; whether planning and zoning commission may deny special permit application on basis of general standards set forth in zoning regulations, even when all technical requirements of regulations have been met; whether substantial evidence existed in record on which commission, in its discretion, could have relied in concluding that school did not meet its burden of demonstrating compliance with general standards in zoning regulations; whether commission reasonably could have concluded that school failed to demonstrate that proposed use would not adversely affect neighboring residential properties due to noise and light emissions, vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and parking issues; whether commission could have concluded that school did not establish that proposed use would not adversely affect neighboring property values, character of adjacent neighborhood or quality of life of residents.
- State v. Boyd, 176 CA 437 19A
Disorderly conduct; interfering with officer; sufficiency of evidence; whether state presented sufficient evidence from which jury reasonably could have found that defendant specifically intended to cause victim inconvenience, annoyance or alarm to support conviction of disorderly conduct; claim that trial court improperly failed to instruct jury concerning definition of terms when it set forth elements of interfering with officer.
- State v. Pugh, 176 CA 518 100A
Murder; burglary in first degree; claim that trial court abused discretion by admitting, pursuant to spontaneous utterance exception to rule against hearsay, testimony regarding statements that witness overheard victim make on day of murder; whether subject statements were spontaneous and unreflective, and made in response to startling occurrence; claim that trial court violated defendant's consti-

(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.

tutional right to confrontation by admitting alleged inadmissible testimonial hearsay; whether state met burden of proving that any error in admitting testimony was harmless beyond reasonable doubt; claim that trial court committed plain error by failing to dismiss, sua sponte, burglary charge; whether defendant was barred from raising statute of limitations defense on appeal where defendant failed to raise defense at trial.

State v. Reed, 176 CA 537 119A

Harassment in second degree; whether defendant lacked fair warning that she could be prosecuted under statute (§ 53a-183 [a] [3]) proscribing second degree harassment on basis of verbal content of telephone call; whether State v. Moulton (310 Conn. 337), which broadened scope of § 53a-183 (a) (3) to proscribe unprotected harassing speech, applied to present case; whether defendant reasonably could have foreseen expansion of scope of § 53a-183 (a) (3) in Moulton; whether state presented sufficient evidence concerning circumstances of defendant's telephone call from which jury reasonably could have found that defendant intended to harass, annoy or alarm to support conviction of harassment in second degree; whether, pursuant to § 53a-183 (a) (3), conduct in placing single telephone call was sufficient to constitute harassment in second degree when call was made with intent to harass, annoy or alarm; whether trial court improperly failed to give jury with limiting instruction concerning consideration of verbal content of telephone call; whether failure to give requested instruction was harmless beyond reasonable doubt.

Wilkins v. Connecticut Childbirth & Women's Center, 176 CA 420 2A

Medical malpractice; claim that defendant was negligent in care and treatment of plaintiff immediately after delivery of child and in postdelivery care; whether trial court abused discretion in submitting threshold jury interrogatory asking jury to determine whether plaintiff had in fact sustained fourth degree laceration and/or severe tear of vaginal tissue, perineal skin and muscle, and anal sphincter muscle during labor and delivery; whether trial court abused discretion in answering jury question; whether trial court's use of first interrogatory and answer to jury question were consistent with language of complaint, evidence elicited at trial and arguments; whether interrogatory was permissible in order to elicit determination of material threshold fact.

Volume 176 Cumulative Table of Cases 199A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Social Services, Department of 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Appointment of Trustee. 2C
Small Claims Decentralization 1C