

325 Conn. 272

APRIL, 2017

277

State v. Bush

acts, but nevertheless properly determined that there was insufficient evidence to support the racketeering conviction. With respect to the other convictions, we conclude that the Appellate Court improperly determined that the denial of a continuance effectively deprived the defendant of his right of self-representation. Accordingly, we affirm in part and reverse in part the judgment of the Appellate Court.

The record and the opinion of the Appellate Court set forth the following background facts and procedural history. “The charges upon which the defendant was brought to trial were based upon his alleged involvement in seven separate sales of cocaine to a police informant, David Hannon, during an undercover police investigation of illegal drug activity in the area of Pembroke and Ogden Streets in Bridgeport between late June through early November, 2010.” *Id.*, 259. As will be discussed more fully in part I B of this opinion, during that time period, the investigating task force of officers from the Bridgeport Police Department and the Connecticut State Police obtained extensive audiotape and videotape surveillance footage of these sales, in which the defendant, working from the porch of his duplex home, which directly abutted the sidewalk on Pembroke Street, sold cocaine to Hannon, or facilitated sales to Hannon by six other drug dealers, namely, David Moreland, Jason Ortiz, Willie Brazil, Raymond Mathis, Carlos Lopez, and Kenneth Jamison.⁴

“In an amended long form information dated January 3, 2012, the state charged the defendant, more particu-

⁴ We note that the state did not specifically allege in the operative information that Brazil, Jamison, and Lopez had participated in any of the narcotics sales of which the defendant was convicted, including those alleged as predicate acts for the racketeering charge. Jamison and Lopez were, however, specifically alleged to be conspirators for purposes of the conspiracy count. The evidence adduced at trial, discussed in detail in part I of this opinion, demonstrates that Brazil and Lopez had some involvement in the narcotics sales of which the defendant was convicted.

NOTE: These pages (325 Conn. 277 and 278) are in replacement of the same numbered pages that appear in the Connecticut Law Journal of 18 April 2017.

278

APRIL, 2017

325 Conn. 272

State v. Bush

larly, with: one count each of sale of narcotics by a person who is not drug-dependent and sale of narcotics within 1500 feet of a school by a person who is not drug-dependent in connection with six of the seven alleged sales; and one count each of conspiracy to sell narcotics and racketeering based upon his alleged involvement in all seven such alleged sales, as specially pleaded both in the conspiracy count, as overt acts in furtherance of the alleged conspiracy, and in the racketeering count, as incidents of racketeering activity claimed to prove his involvement in a pattern of racketeering activity, as required by . . . § 53-396 (a). The jury found the defendant guilty of the lesser included offenses of sale of narcotics by a person who is drug-dependent and sale of narcotics within 1500 feet of a school by a person who is drug-dependent based upon his proven involvement in sales of cocaine to Hannon on the six dates he was charged in the information with committing such offenses, particularly June 30, July 14, July 16, August 6, August 24, and November 9, 2010. The jury also found the defendant guilty of both conspiracy to sell narcotics and racketeering, specifying as to the latter charge, in a special verdict returned pursuant to § 53-396 (b), that the sole basis for its finding that the defendant had engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity as a member of an enterprise was his involvement in the sale of cocaine on two of the seven dates specified in the information, June 30 and November 9, 2010, which it found to have constituted ‘incidents of racketeering activity.’ The trial court later sentenced the defendant on all charges of which he was convicted to a total effective sentence of twenty years incarceration.” (Footnote omitted.) *Id.*, 259–60.

The defendant appealed from the judgment of conviction to the Appellate Court. Although the defendant