

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

The following appeal is assigned for argument in the Supreme Court on May 3, 2018.

MILLY ARCINIEGA et al. v. GISELLE FELICIANO et al., SC 20088
Judicial District of Hartford

Elections; Primaries; Whether Trial Court Properly Approved “Arciniega Slate” for Hartford Democratic Town Committee Primary Election Ballot. The plaintiffs are Milly Arciniega and twelve other Hartford residents (the Arciniega slate) who filed petitions seeking to be on the ballot for the primary for election to the Hartford 6th District Democratic town committee. Among the defendants are Alyssa Peterson and eight others (the Peterson slate) who also petitioned to be candidates for election to the town committee. The Arciniega slate brought this action pursuant to General Statutes § 9-329a, claiming irregularities in the Peterson slate’s petitions and asking that the trial court declare that the Peterson slate’s petitions are invalid and therefore that the Peterson slate was not qualified to run in the primary election that was subsequently held on March 6, 2018. The Peterson slate counterclaimed, seeking declarations that the Arciniega slate’s petitions were invalid and therefore that the Arciniega slate was not qualified to run in the primary. On February 21, 2018, the trial court rendered judgment in favor of the Arciniega slate. The court found that the Peterson slate’s petitions contained forged signatures in clear violation of General Statutes § 9-410 and that extensive fraud had occurred in the gathering of signatures for the Peterson slate. The court also rejected the Peterson slate’s claim that the Arciniega slate’s petitions should be declared invalid because one of the members of the Arciniega slate, Jacqueline Nadal, had listed 646 New Britain Avenue, Hartford, as her address on the petitions. The Peterson slate insisted that Nadal had abandoned that address and that her bona fide residence was 370 Freeman Street in Hartford. The trial court found that Nadal had an ownership interest in both addresses, that the Peterson slate had not met its burden of proving that she had abandoned the 646 New Britain Avenue address and that, as both addresses are within the 6th District, Nadal’s use of the New Britain Avenue address did not affect the authenticity of the petitions and could not amount to any substantial violation of the election statutes. The court ruled that the Peterson slate did not qualify for the primary, and it directed election officials to remove the Peterson slate from the 6th District Democratic town committee primary ballot. Alyssa Peterson appeals, claiming that the trial court wrongly ruled in favor

of the Arciniega slate and wrongly rejected the Peterson slate's claim that Jacqueline Nadal's listing of the New Britain Avenue address constituted a substantial violation of the election statutes such that the Arciniega slate's candidacy petitions should have been declared invalid.

The summaries appearing here are not intended to represent a comprehensive statement of the facts of the case, nor an exhaustive inventory of issues raised on appeal. These summaries are prepared by the Staff Attorneys' Office for the convenience of the bar. They in no way indicate the Supreme Court's view of the factual or legal aspects of the appeal.

*John DeMeo
Chief Staff Attorney*
