

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 47 May 22, 2018 113 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Metropolitan District <i>v.</i> Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities (Order), 328 C 937	5
State <i>v.</i> Hudson (Order), 328 C 936	4
State <i>v.</i> Louis D. (Order), 328 C 936	4
State <i>v.</i> Salmond (Order), 328 C 936	4
Toland <i>v.</i> Toland (Order), 328 C 935	3
Zilkha <i>v.</i> Zilkha (Order), 328 C 937	5
Volume 328 Cumulative Table of Cases	7

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Adams <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Motor Vehicles, 182 CA 165	55A
<i>Administrative appeal; appeal from decision by defendant Commissioner of Motor Vehicles suspending plaintiff's motor vehicle operator's license; whether trial court improperly dismissed appeal; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as opinion of this court.</i>	
Lewis <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 182 CA 901	93A
Peacock <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 182 CA 901	93A
Reyher <i>v.</i> Finkeldey, 182 CA 159	49A
<i>Contracts; real estate; whether trial court erroneously concluded that plaintiff met burden of proving that he procured buyer that was ready, willing and able to purchase defendant's property in accordance with terms of listing agreement where buyer was not ready, willing and able to close on property without fulfillment of certain financing and inspection contingencies.</i>	
State <i>v.</i> Brown, 182 CA 112	2A
<i>Murder; criminal possession of firearm; claim that trial court committed plain error by providing inadequate jury instructions regarding eyewitness testimony and identification reliability; whether defendant explained or demonstrated how trial court's alleged error was obvious, readily discernible or resulted in prejudice, or that manifest injustice occurred as result of alleged instructional omission; whether defendant established legal requirement for trial court, in absence of expert testimony or request from defendant for such instruction, to provide, sua sponte, additional instruction about eyewitness testimony reliability; whether defendant explained how such alleged omission resulted in prejudice; request for this court to exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to review and reverse defendant's conviction.</i>	
State <i>v.</i> Dijmarescu, 182 CA 135.	25A
<i>Breach of peace in second degree; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting defense counsel's motion to withdraw from representation; whether counsel complied with purpose of notice provision in rule of practice (§ 3-10 [a]) applicable to motion to withdraw; claim that motion to withdraw implicated sixth amendment right to counsel; claim that trial court improperly admitted evidence of prior uncharged misconduct; whether trial court violated defendant's right against self-incrimination by failing to canvass defendant to determine if decision to testify was intelligent and voluntary; request for this court to exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice.</i>	
State <i>v.</i> Holmes, 182 CA 124	14A
<i>Felony murder; home invasion; conspiracy to commit home invasion; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying</i>	

(continued on next page)

motion to correct illegal sentence on basis of its finding that defendant's sentence for felony murder had been predicated on defendant's conviction of burglary, which trial court had vacated on double jeopardy grounds; claim that when conviction of burglary in first degree was vacated, conviction of home invasion became predicate offense for felony murder, which violated federal and state constitutions because at time defendant committed offense of home invasion, it was not defined as predicate offense for felony murder in applicable statute (§ 53a-54c); whether fact that trial court vacated defendant's burglary conviction on double jeopardy grounds altered fact that it remained predicate offense for felony murder charge.

White v. Commissioner of Correction, 182 CA 188 78A

Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner's right to due process was violated because guilty plea was not made knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily; claim that petitioner's trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to adequately research and investigate issue of petitioner's mental state at time of guilty plea and to bring information to trial court's attention; claim that medication petitioner was taking on day of guilty plea substantially impacted petitioner's ability to understand plea agreement and proceedings; whether habeas court erred in failing to find that petitioner's due process rights were violated; whether petitioner's guilty plea canvass was constitutionally sufficient; whether habeas court's findings were adequately supported by record; credibility of witnesses; whether habeas court erred in concluding that trial counsel did not render ineffective assistance; whether record showed reasonable probability that petitioner would have chosen to proceed to trial rather than plead guilty if trial counsel had further investigated petitioner's mental state or brought it to trial court's attention.

Volume 182 Cumulative Table of Cases 95A

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice to the Bar and Public of Terms Expiring 1B

Notice of Reinstatement of Attorney 1B

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.