

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 18

October 31, 2017

299 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Avery v. Medina (Order), 327 C 927	7
Clinton S. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 927	7
Emerick v. Emerick (Order), 327 C 922	2
Freeman v. A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. (Order), 327 C 927	7
New Haven Parking Authority v. Long Wharf Realty Corp. (Order), 327 C 928	8
R.T. Vanderbilt Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co. (Orders), 327 C 923, 925	3, 5
Santos v. Stratford (Order), 327 C 926	6
State v. Lewis (Order), 327 C 925	5
Stones Trail, LLC v. Weston (Orders), 327 C 926	6
Wells Fargo Bank, National Assn. v. Tarzia (Order), 327 C 928	8
Volume 327 Cumulative Table of Cases	9

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bruno v. Bruno, 177 CA 599	97A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court, in vacating prior awards of postjudgment interest, exceeded specific direction of remand order from Appellate Court; whether trial court properly vacated awards of postjudgment interest that previously had been awarded in connection with alimony arrearage and bank account in dispute between parties; whether prior awards of postjudgment interest were inextricably intertwined with court's earlier erroneous decision to grant motion for modification of alimony and valuing bank account; whether trial court abused its discretion in awarding defendant interest with regard to alimony arrearage and bank account in dispute between parties; claim that trial court erred in employing incorrect time frame and improper rate in calculating subsequent awards of postjudgment interest; whether trial court abused its discretion in awarding interest at rate of 4 percent; whether trial court properly held defendant in contempt for violating court order; whether underlying order was sufficiently clear and unambiguous as to support judgment of contempt.</i>	
Emerick v. Glastonbury, 177 CA 701	199A
<i>Private nuisance; whether trial court abused its discretion in dismissing action as sanction for plaintiff's actions during trial; whether plaintiff's continuing and deliberate misconduct during trial demonstrated such disregard for trial court's orders as to warrant dismissal; claim that trial court did not adhere to standards of stare decisis; claim that dismissal followed from finding of contempt or because of judicial bias; claim that trial court failed to consider motions for mistrial or requests for recusal; claim that dismissal violated plaintiff's constitutional right to procedural process; failure to brief claim adequately.</i>	
Garvey v. Valencis, 177 CA 578	76A
<i>Child custody and visitation; claim that trial court improperly entered emergency ex parte custody order in violation of statute (§ 46b-56f [c]) because plaintiff was available, desired to participate, and was present in courthouse when court entered ex parte order; claim that § 46b-56f (c) mandates that hearing be completed within fourteen days after emergency ex parte order is issued; whether trial court's ex parte order expired automatically after thirty days, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 4-5); whether trial court violated plaintiff's constitutional right to procedural due process by entering ex parte custody order, and then extending order for unreasonably lengthy period of time; whether plaintiff waived her right</i>	

(continued on next page)

to object to length of hearing; whether trial court's finding that immediate and present risk of psychological harm to child existed was clearly erroneous. 256A

In re Ceana R., 177 CA 758. 256A
Child neglect; whether trial court abused its discretion in permitting respondent father's fourth appointed counsel to withdraw as counsel; whether trial court properly determined that de facto termination of attorney-client relationship occurred based on father's filing of grievance against his fourth appointed counsel in juvenile proceeding; whether trial court abused its discretion in finding that father waived his statutory right to appointed counsel by his conduct.

Ray v. Ray, 177 CA 544. 42A
Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motion for order; motion to reargue; claim that plaintiff failed to provide adequate record for review of claims on appeal; claim that trial court erred by entering order establishing defendant's child support obligation without making finding as to defendant's net income; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly relied on unsworn child support guidelines worksheet in making certain findings; claim that trial court erred by failing to take into account defendant's income in excess of his base salary in determining his child support obligation; whether court's order complied with state regulations (§ 46b-215a-1 et seq.) pertaining to child support and arrearage guidelines; whether trial court abused its discretion by ordering presumptive minimum amount of child support under child support guidelines and declining to enter supplemental order based on defendant's deferred compensation income; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying relief requested by plaintiff in motion to reargue.

Spencer v. Spencer, 177 CA 504. 2A
Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly construed term "cohabitation" in dissolution judgment as not requiring evidence of romantic or sexual relationship; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting defendant's motion for termination of alimony based on cohabitation; whether trial court's finding that plaintiff cohabitated within meaning of statute (§ 46b-86 [b]) was clearly erroneous; claim that defendant sought termination of alimony with unclean hands based on wilful nonpayment of alimony; whether trial court abused its discretion in modifying alimony; whether finding that defendant experienced substantial change in financial circumstances was clearly erroneous; whether defendant met his burden of proving that reduction of income was not result of neglect or culpable conduct; whether amount by which trial court modified defendant's alimony obligation was proportionate to decrease in his income; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's motions for contempt.

State v. Lopez, 177 CA 651. 149A
Operating motor vehicle while under influence of alcohol in violation of statute (§ 14-227a [a] [1]); operating motor vehicle while license suspended; whether trial court abused its discretion in sustaining objections to defendant's attempts on cross-examination to question state's expert witness regarding his lack of

(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.

knowledge as to defendant's blood alcohol content level; whether defendant met burden of demonstrating that trial court's undue restriction on cross-examination of state's expert was harmful; whether evidence of defendant's blood alcohol content can be admitted where defendant charged under behavioral subdivision of § 14-227a; whether there was substantial question regarding scientific reliability of expert's opinion evidence; claim that trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence DVD that contained video of traffic stop; reviewability of unpreserved claim that admission of DVD was improper on ground that it was incomplete or potentially altered; whether unpreserved claim was evidentiary in nature; whether admission of DVD constituted plain error; whether DVD was sufficiently authenticated.

U.S. Bank National Assn., Trustee v. Blowers, 177 CA 622 120A
Foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly granted motion to strike special defenses and counterclaims; whether trial court properly determined that special defenses did not relate to making, validity or enforcement of subject note and mortgage; whether transaction test set forth in rule of practice (§ 10-10) applied to special defenses; whether allegations in counterclaims were sufficient to establish that counterclaims had reasonable nexus to making, validity or enforcement of note or mortgage pursuant to transaction test; request for this court to adopt transaction test that did not include requirement that special defenses and counterclaims have reasonable nexus to, or relate to, making, validity or enforcement of note or mortgage; claim that trial court erred in its interpretation of scope of term enforcement; whether trial court erred in finding that no binding loan modification existed between parties.

Yashenko v. Commissioner of Correction, 177 CA 740 238A
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly denied petition for writ of habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to convey to state petitioner's acceptance of plea offer; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to prevent plea offer from lapsing; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.

Volume 177 Cumulative Table of Cases 277A

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Application for Reinstatement to the Bar 1B