

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 46

May 15, 2018

252 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

| | |
|---|----|
| MacDermid, Inc. v. Leonetti, 328 C 726 | 20 |
| <i>Unjust enrichment; workers' compensation; whether plaintiff employer's unjust enrichment claim was barred by doctrine of collateral estoppel; claim that plaintiff's recovery was barred by statutory (§§ 31-290 and 31-296) provisions requiring approval of contractual workers' compensation releases, public policy, and severability clause contained in termination agreement between parties; preservation of issues through motions for directed verdict, discussed; whether trial court improperly failed to instruct jury in accordance with defendant's preliminary requests to charge; claim that trial court's instruction on unjust enrichment improperly permitted jury to find for plaintiff in absence of proof that any of defendant's actions or omissions caused plaintiff injury; whether defendant's claim of instructional error was barred by general verdict rule; claim that trial court improperly excluded certain documents from evidence; whether certain evidentiary claims were rendered moot by defendant's failure to challenge independent grounds for exclusion.</i> | |
| Meribear Productions, Inc. v. Frank, 328 C 709 | 3 |
| <i>Action to enforce foreign default judgment; breach of contract; quantum meruit; certification from Appellate Court; whether trial court's judgment was final as to both defendants; whether Appellate Court lacked jurisdiction over defendants' joint appeal; two categories of alternative theory cases distinguished for purposes of final judgment rule.</i> | |
| Micek-Holt v. Papageorge (Order), 328 C 934 | 56 |
| Papageorge v. Micek-Holt (Order) (See Micek-Holt v. Papageorge), 328 C 934 | 56 |
| Stackpole v. Stamford (Order), 328 C 933 | 55 |
| State v. Robert S. (Order), 328 C 933 | 55 |
| State v. Soyini (Order), 328 C 935 | 57 |
| State v. Thomas (Order), 328 C 935 | 57 |
| State v. Walker (Order), 328 C 934 | 56 |
| Valley National Bank v. Private Transerve, LLC (Order), 328 C 933 | 55 |
| Volume 328 Cumulative Table of Cases | 59 |

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Cortez v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 181 CA 905 | 51A |
| Kaminski v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 181 CA 903 | 49A |
| Lambeck v. Silver Hill Hospital, Inc. (AC 40096) (Memorandum Decision), 181 CA 904 . . | 50A |
| Lambeck v. Silver Hill Hospital, Inc. (AC 40097) (Memorandum Decision), 181 CA 904 . . | 50A |
| Magana v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (Memorandum Decision), 181 CA 904 | 50A |
| Puente v. Progressive Northwestern Ins. Co., 181 CA 852 | 32A |
| <i>Underinsured motorist coverage; summary judgment; claim that there were genuine issues of material fact as to whether policy issued to plaintiff's business provided underinsured coverage to plaintiff personally, regardless of whether plaintiff was occupying insured vehicle; claim that there were genuine issues of material fact as to whether plaintiff was "occupying" insured vehicle within meaning of policy when plaintiff was struck by third party after plaintiff stepped out of insured vehicle and walked past rear of vehicle; whether definition of occupy in underinsured motorist statute (§ 38a-363 [c]), which required physical contact with</i> | |

(continued on next page)

| | |
|--|------|
| <i>insured vehicle in order to trigger coverage, applied to policy that used term "exiting" instead of "alighting from" insured vehicle.</i> | |
| Thomasi v. Thomasi, 181 CA 822 | 2A |
| <i>Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment orders; claim that trial court erred in determining term "marital portion" was clear and unambiguous as to calculation method of plaintiff's portion of defendant's pension plan; claim that trial court erred in denying motion for modification of alimony and interpreting dissolution agreement to require defendant to make retroactive payments to plaintiff; whether trial court correctly determined that language of dissolution agreement clearly and unambiguously provided for coverture method to be utilized to determine marital portion; whether term "marital portion" contained latent ambiguity; whether trial court misplaced focus by relying on extrinsic evidence to resolve parties' disagreement as to import of term "marital portion"; whether trial court erred in denying motion for alimony modification; whether trial court's factual finding that defendant caused loss of employment through his own fault was clearly erroneous; whether, as of date of dissolution, plaintiff was entitled to receive one half of marital portion of defendant's monthly pension benefits; whether trial court should have adjusted defendant's retroactive payments for any tax liability defendant incurred for portion of pension that was intended for plaintiff as share of marital portion.</i> | |
| Volume 181 Cumulative Table of Cases | 53A |
| Asia M. v. Geoffrey M., 182 CA 22. | 84A |
| <i>Acknowledgment of paternity; child support; whether trial court erred in concluding that Ragin v. Lee (78 Conn. App. 848) provided fourth and independent ground to open acknowledgment of paternity, apart from statutory grounds of fraud, mistake of fact, and duress, as set forth in applicable statutory provision ([Rev. to 2011] § 46b-172 [a] [2]); whether trial court erred in determining that family support magistrate had inherent authority to open judgment of paternity on basis of best interests of child.</i> | |
| Battistotti v. Suzanne A., 182 CA 40. | 102A |
| <i>Child custody; whether trial court abused its discretion in failing to analyze whether plaintiff's visitation expenses warranted deviation from child support guidelines; claim that trial court abused its discretion in restricting plaintiff's parenting time with child to town of Greenwich.</i> | |
| General Ins. Co. of America v. Okeke, 182 CA 83. | 145A |
| <i>Declaratory judgment; insurance; action seeking declaratory judgment to determine whether insurer was obligated to defend and indemnify insureds in certain civil actions brought against them; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly determined that insurer had no duty to defend or indemnify insureds; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as statement of facts and applicable law on issues.</i> | |
| Geoffrey M. v. Asia M. (See Asia M. v. Geoffrey M.), 182 CA 22 | 84A |

(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.

Plainville v. Almost Home Animal Rescue & Shelter, Inc., 182 CA 55 117A
Negligence per se; unjust enrichment; motion to strike; claim that trial court applied improper legal standard in ruling on motion to strike; whether trial court properly struck count of complaint alleging negligence per se; whether trial court correctly determined that plaintiffs were not among intended beneficiaries of applicable statute (§ 53-247 [a]); whether, as matter of law, plaintiffs could not rely on § 53-247 (a) as basis for maintaining negligence per se action against defendant; whether trial court properly struck count of complaint alleging unjust enrichment; whether plaintiffs could not avail themselves of action sounding in unjust enrichment in light of adequate statutory (§ 22-329a [h]) remedy.

State v. Bennett, 182 CA 71 133A
Motion to correct illegal sentence; motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly dismissed, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, postjudgment motions to dismiss information under which defendant was convicted where motions did not raise issues over which court had jurisdiction beyond defendant's sentencing date; whether trial court abused its discretion by denying portion of motion to correct illegal sentence that claimed defendant had been sentenced on basis of materially inaccurate information contained in presentence investigation report.

State v. Hall, 182 CA 103 165A
Manlaughter in first degree; claim that trial court improperly failed to provide jury with instruction concerning defendant's lack of duty to retreat from scene of incident in violation of sixth amendment right to present defense; whether duty to retreat played part in defendant's criminal trial; whether defendant established existence of constitutional violation that deprived him of fair trial.

Ugalde v. Saint Mary's Hospital, Inc., 182 CA 1 63A
Medical malpractice; whether trial court erred in denying request for leave to amend complaint where request was filed after expiration of statute of limitations for wrongful death actions; whether trial court improperly dismissed action for lack of personal jurisdiction where complaint was supported by opinion letter from health care provider that was legally insufficient under statute (§ 52-190a [a]); whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to reargue denial of motion to set aside judgment of nonsuit.

Volume 182 Cumulative Table of Cases 175A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Energy and Environmental Protection, Dept. of 1B
 Social Services, Dept. of 1B, 2B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Reprimand of Attorneys 1C, 2C
 Notice of Application for Reinstatement to the Bar 1C
 Probate Court Contract Conservator Program. 1C