

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 16 October 17, 2017 298 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

American First Federal, Inc. v. Gordon (Order), 327 C 909	35
Bozelko v. D'Albero (Order), 327 C 912	38
James v. Commissioner of Correction, 327 C 24	2
<i>Habeas corpus; whether calculation of presentence confinement credit should be adjusted for concurrent sentences imposed under one docket number but on different dates due to mistrial; whether denial of presentence confinement credit impermissibly burdened petitioner's constitutional right to pursue double jeopardy claim on retrial.</i>	
Reserve Realty, LLC v. BLT Reserve, LLC (Order), 327 C 911.	37
Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC (Orders), 327 C 910,911	36, 37
State v. Ames (Order), 327 C 908	34
State v. Joseph (Order), 327 C 912	38
State v. Smith (Order), 327 C 910	36
State v. Torres (Order), 327 C 910	36
State v. Wiggins (Order), 327 C 908.	34
Townsend v. Hardy (Order), 327 C 909.	35
Volume 327 Cumulative Table of Cases	39

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of New York Mellon, Trustee v. Mauro, 177 CA 295	117A
<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court improperly granted motion for judgment of strict foreclosure on basis of ruling granting motion for summary judgment as to liability for foreclosure; claim that genuine issues of material fact existed as to whether counterclaims had reasonable nexus to making, validity, or enforcement of mortgage and note that precluded granting of motion for summary judgment; whether trial court properly concluded that counterclaims based on alleged misdealings with defendants by original lender failed as matter of law because there was no evidence of record that plaintiff expressly assumed liabilities of original lender when it took mortgage from original lender by assignment; whether trial court properly rendered judgment in favor of plaintiff on all five counts of counterclaim; whether trial court properly rendered judgment dismissing counterclaims that pertained to plaintiff's conduct during mediation that occurred years after execution of mortgage and defendants' default; whether counterclaims were improperly joined in action pursuant to transaction test of applicable rule of practice (§ 10-10); motion for summary judgment seeking dismissal of counterclaims for improper joinder treated as motion to strike; whether party may properly use motion for summary judgment as means of testing whether counterclaims satisfied transaction test of § 10-10.</i>	
Faile v. Stratford, 177 CA 183	5A
<i>Tax appeals; whether trial court abused its discretion in rendering judgments of nonsuit; whether more deferential general abuse of discretion standard of review applied to trial court's judgments of nonsuit, or more nuanced abuse of discretion standard as set forth in Millbrook Owners Assn., Inc. v. Hamilton Standard (257 Conn. 1); whether trial court's findings that plaintiff violated court's pretrial settlement conference order by not having someone with ultimate authority to settle matters present at pretrial settlement conference, and by failing to bring to conference every physical piece of paper that would be offered into evidence at</i>	

(continued on next page)

trial were clearly erroneous; whether plaintiff established clear error in trial court's finding that attorney did not have ultimate authority to settle tax appeals related to plaintiff limited liability company; whether dismissal or nonsuit as sanction for failure of party to attend pretrial settlement conference when party was ill and in hospital served justice or vindicated legitimate interests of other party and court.

Lange v. Stratford (See Faile v. Stratford), 177 CA 183 5A
Little v. Commissioner of Correction, 177 CA 337 159A

Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal as to claim that State v. Salomon (287 Conn. 509) applied retroactively to collateral attack on kidnapping conviction when, pursuant to plea agreement, petitioner pleaded guilty to only that charge; adoption of general presumption that Salomon applies retroactively in habeas corpus proceedings; whether traditional rationales underlying writ of habeas corpus favored applying Salomon retroactively; whether there was risk that petitioner stood convicted of act that law did not make criminal; reviewability of claim of actual innocence raised for first time on appeal.

N759ZD, LLC v. Stratford (See Faile v. Stratford), 177 CA 183 5A
Smith v. Redding, 177 CA 283 105A

Public nuisance; reviewability of claim that trial court abused its discretion by excluding evidence of subsequent remedial measures by defendant town; failure of plaintiff to provide complete record of trial proceedings; reviewability of claim that trial court failed to instruct jury on applicable zoning regulations as safety standard.

State v. Hall-Davis, 177 CA 211 33A

Murder; conspiracy to commit murder; criminal possession of firearm; whether trial court properly declined to instruct jury on theory of defense of others; whether evidence supported finding that victim was at imminent risk of great bodily harm; whether preemptive strike is justified under defense of others theory; whether defendant met burden of showing that it would have been objectively reasonable for him to believe that victim was at imminent risk of having great bodily harm inflicted on her; unpreserved claim that trial court improperly restricted defense counsel from arguing defense of others and renunciation of criminal purpose during closing argument; whether defendant demonstrated that alleged constitutional violation existed and deprived him of fair trial; whether defendant was entitled to relief under plain error doctrine; whether defendant waived claim that trial court gave jury faulty and misleading instruction on conspiracy when he had meaningful opportunity to review instruction but failed to object.

State v. Hathaway, 177 CA 279 101A

Motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court improperly dismissed motion to correct illegal sentence for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that sentence of twenty-five years of incarceration for murder imposed upon juvenile violated prohibition in eighth amendment to United States constitution against cruel and unusual punishment; claim that sentence of twenty-five years of incarceration

(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.

for murder imposed upon juvenile violated article first, §§ 8 and 9, of state constitution.

State v. Rivera, 177 CA 242. 64A

Motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court improperly dismissed motion to correct illegal sentence for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that twenty-five year mandatory minimum sentence without possibility of parole for juvenile homicide offender was unconstitutional under eighth amendment to United States constitution, as interpreted by Miller v. Alabama (567 U.S. 460); whether sentencing court was required to consider juvenile offender's youth and attendant characteristics as mitigating factors prior to sentencing juvenile homicide offender to life without possibility of parole where defendant was now eligible for parole; claim that mandatory minimum sentence of twenty-five years of incarceration without possibility of parole imposed on juvenile homicide offender was unconstitutional under article first, §§ 8 and 9, of state constitution; whether factors set forth in State v. Geisler (222 Conn. 672) to be considered in defining scope and parameters of state constitution supported defendant's state constitutional claim; whether mandatory minimum sentence of twenty-five years of incarceration imposed on juvenile offender constituted cruel and unusual punishment under federal precedent; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court committed constitutional error when it improperly accepted defendant's waiver, through counsel, of right to presentence investigation report without canvassing defendant prior to permitting waiver; failure to raise claim in motion to correct illegal sentence.

State v. Stonick, 177 CA 181 3A

Larceny in sixth degree; illegal use of credit card; whether trial court improperly noted entry of nolle prosequi over defendant's objection and request for dismissal when there was no allegation by state that any material witness had died, disappeared or become disabled, or that material evidence had disappeared or had been destroyed and that further investigation was necessary, as required by statute (§ 54-56b).

State v. Thomas, 177 CA 369. 191A

Sexual assault in first degree; unlawful restraint in first degree; false statement in second degree; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional rights to confrontation and to present defense when it ruled that rape shield statute (§ 54-86f (a)) prohibited him from introducing evidence of victim's prior sexual conduct; claim that evidence of victim's prior sexual conduct was admissible to impeach her credibility pursuant to exceptions to § 54-86f (a); whether victim testified, either explicitly or by reasonable inference, about her sexual conduct with anyone other than defendant such that evidence of her prior sexual conduct was admissible for impeachment purposes under § 54-86f (a) (2); whether impeaching victim's credibility with evidence of her prior sexual conduct, and with inconsistent statement she had made to hospital nurse, was so relevant and material, pursuant to § 54-86f (a) (4), that its exclusion violated defendant's constitutional rights; reviewability of unpreserved claim that evidence of victim's prior sexual conduct should have been admitted, pursuant to § 54-86f (a) (1), to show alternative source for scrapes and bruises on victim's body after sexual assault; reviewability of unpreserved claim that defendant was improperly prohibited from inquiring and presenting evidence about victim's relationship with another man in order to show victim's motive and bias to lie; whether unpreserved claim was of constitutional magnitude for purposes of review pursuant to State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233); whether evidence of victim's prior sexual conduct was probative, pursuant to § 54-86f (a) (1), of whether her vaginal injuries could have been caused by anyone other than defendant; claim that trial court abused its discretion by denying motion for funds to pay for investigative services for defense; whether trial court had discretion to grant request for funds; whether defendant failed to make proper showing that funds for investigative services were reasonable and necessary to defense; claim that defendant was denied right to fair trial as result of prosecutorial impropriety; whether comments of prosecutor demeaned or impugned integrity of defense counsel; whether prosecutor improperly appealed to jurors' emotions or referred to facts or documents that were not in evidence; reviewability of claim that prosecutor improperly vouched for victim's credibility; failure to brief claim adequately.

Williams v. Commissioner of Correction, 177 CA 321 143A

Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; whether habeas court properly rejected claim that petitioner's trial counsel was ineffective in failing to challenge state's medical evidence by consulting and calling rebuttal medical expert witness; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner failed to prove that trial

counsel was ineffective by failing to present testimony of witness to support potential defense of physical incapability.

Zhang v. 56 Locust Road, LLC, 177 CA 420 242A

Quiet title; claim that trial court improperly found in plaintiffs' favor on claim of adverse possession; claim that trial court improperly granted defendant easement by necessity.

O'Brien v. O'Brien (replacement pages), 159 CA 95-6 v

Volume 177 Cumulative Table of Cases 423A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Social Services, Department of 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Hearing on Application for Reinstatement to the Bar 2C

Small Claims Decentralization 1C
