

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 25 December 18, 2018 176 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Chamerda v. Opie (Order), 330 C 953	3
Dahle v. Stop & Shop Supermarket Co., LLC (Order), 330 C 953	3
Seven Oaks Enterprises, L.P. v. DeVito (Order), 330 C 953	3
Volume 330 Cumulative Table of Cases	5

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Gaughan v. Higgins, 186 CA 618	10A
<i>Quiet title; trespass; whether trial court properly credited testimony of plaintiffs' expert witness; whether trial court's factual findings were clearly erroneous; claim that trial court erred in finding that defendant trespassed on plaintiffs' property; claim that trial court improperly awarded plaintiffs fees of expert witness as element of bill of costs; claim that trial court improperly denied request for common-law punitive damages and attorney's fees; claim that trial court improperly concluded that defendant did not slander plaintiffs' title.</i>	
Jenkins v. Jenkins, 186 CA 641	33A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; arbitration; whether trial court improperly denied motion to vacate arbitration award issued in connection with dissolution of marriage; claim that arbitrator improperly precluded testimony of psychiatrist in violation of statute (§ 52-418 [a] [3]); claim that arbitrator was not impartial in violation of § 52-418 (a) (2); whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff failed to meet burden that she was deprived of full and fair hearing; whether in absence of recordings of arbitration proceedings, trial court properly considered length of proceedings and rulings to determine that plaintiff had full and fair opportunity to present case; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff failed to meet burden of demonstrating that arbitrator was partial.</i>	
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Speer (Memorandum Decision), 186 CA 903	137A
Konover v. Kolakowski, 186 CA 706	98A
<i>Contracts; indemnification; attorney's fees; breach of fiduciary duty; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment in defendants' favor; whether trial court properly determined that language of agreement clearly and unambiguously did not obligate defendants to reimburse named plaintiff for certain legal fees incurred during existing litigation; claim that even if agreement was clear and unambiguous, this court should look beyond four corners of agreement to consider meaning that parties ascribed to indemnification provisions of agreement by their course of conduct; whether, where contract language is clear and unambiguous, intent of parties is question of law, subject to plenary review, contract is to be given effect according to its terms and courts must look only to four corners of contract to discern parties' intent; whether intent of parties in utilizing language in question was not binding on court's legal determination of import of contract language; claim that there are circumstances in which extrinsic evidence may be referenced to glean intent of parties in their utilization of plain language; claim that this court should stray from well reasoned jurisprudence that plain language should be accorded its plain meaning.</i>	
Norwich v. Loskoutova (Memorandum Decision), 186 CA 904	138A
Ravalese v. Lertora, 186 CA 722	114A
<i>Defamation; absolute immunity; litigation privilege; whether trial court erred in holding that report of defendant psychologist related to postdissolution proceedings</i>	

(continued on next page)

were prepared for purpose of litigation and that defendant's statements therein were protected by absolute immunity.

Reinke v. Sing, 186 CA 665. 57A
Marital dissolution; postjudgment orders; claim that trial court erred by failing to find that defendant committed fraud when he submitted inaccurate financial affidavits to court at time of original dissolution judgment; claim that once under-reporting of income and assets was proven, burden shifted to defendant to prove fair dealing by clear and convincing evidence; whether trial court's conclusion that plaintiff failed to prove fraud was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court abused its discretion in rendering orders with respect to alimony, distribution of certain marital property, and attorney's fees; whether trial court, having found no wrongdoing by defendant and having expressly found that plaintiff did not sustain her burden of proving defendant acted fraudulently, was obligated to penalize defendant by awarding plaintiff greater alimony or asset awards; claim that trial court abused its discretion by failing in its financial orders to promote full and frank disclosure in financial affidavits and by failing to address adequately defendant's omission of substantial income and assets from his financial affidavits.

State v. Miller, 186 CA 654 46A
Motion to correct illegal sentence; whether trial court improperly denied motion to correct illegal sentence without first providing defendant with meaningful opportunity to be heard; whether trial court was not authorized to dispose summarily of motion to correct pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 43-22) or any other relevant legal authorities; whether trial court's failure to provide defendant with hearing was improper because defendant had attempted to raise issue of first impression under our state constitution.

State v. Mota-Royaceli, 186 CA 735 127A
Manslaughter in first degree; claim that trial court erred in limiting defense counsel's questioning of prospective jurors regarding finality of verdict; whether defendant was prejudiced by fact that trial court limited defense counsel's questioning; claim that trial court impermissibly coerced jury in giving Chip Smith charge on Friday afternoon.

U.S. Equities Corp. v. Ceraldi, 186 CA 610 2A
Debt collection; postjudgment interest; motion for clarification; claim that trial court's order granting motion for clarification and setting forth 10 percent rate of postjudgment interest pursuant to statute (§ 37-3a), constituted improper substantive modification of judgment; failure of plaintiff to move to open judgment to determine rate of interest within four month postjudgment period as prescribed by applicable statute (§ 52-212a).

Volume 186 Cumulative Table of Cases 139A

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

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.

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Connecticut State Dental Commission—Notice of Declaratory Ruling Proceeding 1C

MISCELLANEOUS

Bar Examining Committee—List of Applicants 1D
Notice of Interim Suspension and Appointment of Trustee 4D
Notice of Online Dispute Resolution Pilot Program for Contract Collection (C40) Cases 5D
Notice of Reinstatement of Attorney 5D
Office of the Chief Public Defender 3D

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL NOTICE DEADLINES

2019 Deadline Schedule for Law Journal Notice Submission 1E
