

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 17

October 23, 2018

183 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Abrams v. PH Architects, LLC (Order), 330 C 925 . . . . .	3
Bank of America, N.A. v. Kydes (Order), 330 C 925 . . . . .	3
Bank of America, N.A. v. Nino (Order), 330 C 927 . . . . .	5
Bank of New York Mellon v. Gilmore (Order), 330 C 926 . . . . .	4
Barker v. All Roofs by Dominic (Order), 330 C 925 . . . . .	3
Connecticut National Mortgage Co. v. Knudsen (Order), 330 C 926 . . . . .	4
Hilario's Truck Center, LLC v. Rinaldi (Order), 330 C 925 . . . . .	3
Krahel v. Czoch (Order), 330 C 927 . . . . .	5
State v. Day (Order), 330 C 924 . . . . .	2
State v. White (Order), 330 C 924 . . . . .	2
Szymonik v. Szymonik (Order), 330 C 924 . . . . .	2
State v. Evans (replacement pages), 329 C 781-786 . . . . .	v
Volume 330 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	7

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Agosto v. Premier Maintenance, Inc., 185 CA 559 . . . . .	49A
<i>Employment discrimination; whether trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment; whether trial court improperly applied pretext model of analysis under McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green (411 U.S. 792) and Texas Dept. of Community Affairs v. Burdine (450 U.S. 248), rather than mixed-motive model of analysis under Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins (490 U.S. 228), in determining whether plaintiff established prima facie case of employment discrimination; whether trial court properly determined that there were no genuine issues of material fact as to whether circumstances under which plaintiff was discharged from employment gave rise to prima facie inference of discrimination; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment on claim that defendant retaliated against plaintiff; whether allegations constituted protected activity.</i>	
Chamerda v. Opie, 185 CA 627 . . . . .	117A
<i>Slander of title; motion for summary judgment; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; standing; absolute immunity; whether trial court had subject matter jurisdiction over slander of title claims; whether named plaintiff had standing to bring subject claims; whether defendants' actions and statements in preparing and recording quitclaim deed and survey were absolutely privileged; whether preparation and recording of deed and survey were too remote in time from probate action to be related thereto and too dissimilar in nature to kinds of statements doctrine of absolute immunity was meant to protect as privileged; claim that trial court should have granted motions for summary because claims were time barred; whether three year statute of limitations for torts (§ 52-577) was applicable to slander of title claims; claim that equity demanded that this court recognize defendants' actions to be continuing course of conduct such that limitations period was tolled until release of certain notices of lis pendens.</i>	
In re Madison M., 185 CA 512 . . . . .	2A
<i>Termination of parental rights; appeal from termination of respondent father's parental rights pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112 [j] [3] [B] [i]) for his failure to</i>	

(continued on next page)

achieve sufficient personal rehabilitation after children previously had been found to be neglected; whether trial court erred in holding that father had been provided specific rehabilitative steps in manner that satisfied requirements of § 17a-112 (j) (3) (B) (i); whether, even if father had not been provided specific steps, such omission constituted harmless error.

Langston v. Commissioner of Correction, 185 CA 528 . . . . . 18A

Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly dismissed habeas petition as untimely filed; claim that petitioner's untimely petition did not violate spirit of statute (§ 52-470 [d] and [e]) because it concerned issues that were litigated for several years; claim that good cause existed for filing untimely petition where, in withdrawing prior timely petition, petitioner claimed he was following advice of former attorney and did not understand consequences of his decision.

Seven Oaks Enterprises, L.P. v. DeVito, 185 CA 534 . . . . . 24A

Contracts; breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; whether trial court erred in denying motions to set aside verdict and for judgment notwithstanding verdict as to breach of contract claim; claim that plaintiff company did not have power to enforce note because it could not satisfy requirements of statutory (§ 42a-3-309) provision governing enforcement of lost, destroyed, or stolen instruments; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for judgment notwithstanding verdict and in refusing to set aside verdict in favor of plaintiffs as to their claims of breach regarding management contract; claim that neither plaintiff had right to enforce management contract; reviewability of claim that alleged breaches did not cause any loss to plaintiffs.

State v. Gayle (Memorandum Decision), 185 CA 906 . . . . . 148A

State v. Montanez, 185 CA 589. . . . . 79A

Murder; conspiracy to violate dependency-producing drug laws; carrying pistol without permit; criminal possession of firearm; violation of probation; unpreserved claim that trial court improperly denied motion for mistrial after jury reported to court that there was bullet hole in window in jury deliberation room; claim that trial court abused its discretion by inquiring of jury as group as to whether jury could follow court's instruction and remain fair and impartial; claim that bullet hole incident was presumptively prejudicial to defendant's case; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that testimony about drive test survey data was admissible in evidence under test for admissibility of scientific evidence in State v. Porter (241 Conn. 57); whether trial court improperly concluded that testimony about drive test survey data was reliable and relevant under Porter; harmlessess of admission of drive test survey data.

Volume 185 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 149A

**SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES**

Summaries . . . . . 1B

(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](http://www.jud.ct.gov)

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*  
Published Weekly – Available at <https://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.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Bar Examining Committee . . . . .	1C
Notice of Suspension of Attorney . . . . .	1C

---