

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 33 February 13, 2018 177 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Bozelko v. Statewide Construction, Inc. (Order), 328 C 907	31
Colon v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 328 C 907	31
Cuozzo v. Orange (Order), 328 C 906	30
Griswold v. Camputaro (Order), 328 C 904	28
Kirby of Norwich v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act, 328 C 38	2
<i>Unemployment compensation; whether members of plaintiff's sales force who engaged in door-to-door sales of plaintiff's products were employees of plaintiff or independent contractors under Unemployment Compensation Act (§ 31-222 et seq.); whether trial court correctly determined that plaintiff failed to establish that sales representatives were customarily engaged in independently established trade, occupation, profession or business of same nature as that involved in service performed for plaintiff, as required by part C of ABC test, as set forth in § 31-222 (a) (1) (B) (ii) (I), (II) and (III), which governs determination of whether services performed by individual constitute employment; claim that trial court interpreted § 31-222 (a) (1) (B) (ii) (III) too narrowly and incorrectly concluded that sales representatives were plaintiff's employees; whether trial court properly dismissed appeals from decisions of defendant Employment Security Board of Review; failure of plaintiff to present evidence of factors that court may consider under totality of circumstances test for evaluating dynamics of relationship between putative employee and employer; claim that this court should reconsider and overrule prior case law holding that part C of ABC test is satisfied only if putative employee is actually engaged in independently established trade, occupation, profession or business of same nature as that involved in service performed for putative employer.</i>	
Spencer v. Spencer (Order), 328 C 903	27
State v. Johnson (Order), 328 C 905	29
State v. Smith (Order), 328 C 906	30
State v. Stanley (Order), 328 C 907	31
U.S. Bank National Assn., Trustee v. Blowers (Order), 328 C 904	28
Wiederman v. Halpert (Order), 328 C 906	30
Volume 328 Cumulative Table of Cases	33

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

ASPIC, LLC v. Poitier, 179 CA 631	29A
<i>Prejudgment remedy; whether trial court committed clear error in granting application for prejudgment remedy; whether burden shifted to plaintiff to establish probable cause to believe that it would be successful on merits of cause of action and that it had engaged in fair dealing where defendant specifically pleaded breach of fiduciary duty defense and trial court found fiduciary relationship; whether trial court improperly failed to make any finding that plaintiff had met burden to show that there was probable cause that it would prevail in establishing transactions at issue were product of fair dealing; whether plaintiff was required to prove fair dealing by clear and convincing evidence or probable cause; whether trial court's finding that it could not make any prediction regarding fiduciary duty defense, without more, should have led to conclusion that plaintiff failed to meet burden to establish probable cause that it could prove fairness of transactions; whether, by granting prejudgment remedy in absence of any finding that plaintiff</i>	

(continued on next page)

	<i>had met burden, trial court improperly placed burden of proving unfairness of transactions on defendant.</i>	
Brown v. Shehadeh (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 906		122A
Martin v. Commissioner of Correction, 179 CA 647.		45A
	<i>Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner was denied due process right to fair trial as result of admission at criminal trial of testimony regarding comparative bullet lead analysis, which has subsequently been discredited; whether this court was left with belief that but for challenged testimony, petitioner most likely would not have been convicted; whether habeas court properly rejected claim that prior habeas counsel was ineffective in handling of claim regarding lead analysis evidence; whether petitioner established that prior habeas counsel's performance was deficient or that he was prejudiced thereby.</i>	
Omar v. Commissioner of Correction, 179 CA 696		94A
	<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel was ineffective by exposing petitioner's criminal history to jury; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner failed to prove that he was prejudiced by allegedly deficient performance of trial counsel; whether result of petitioner's criminal trial would have been different but for trial counsel's decision to expose petitioner's criminal history to jury.</i>	
State v. Antwon W., 179 CA 668.		66A
	<i>Sexual assault in first degree in violation of statute (§ 53a-70 [a] [1] and [2]); sexual assault in third degree; risk of injury to child; motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that sentencing court improperly relied on inaccurate and unreliable information in sentencing defendant on three counts of sexual assault in first degree under § 53a-70 (a) (1) because sentences were imposed before vacatur, on grounds of double jeopardy, of defendant's conviction of three parallel counts of and associated concurrent sentences for sexual assault in first degree under § 53a-70 (a) (2); whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to correct illegal sentence; whether trial court considered conviction of counts under different subdivisions of sexual assault statute separately and distinctly; whether trial court improperly dismissed motion to correct instead of denying motion to correct; whether claim that sentencing court relied on inaccurate information in imposing sentence fell within common-law jurisdiction of court.</i>	
State v. Latour (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 907		123A
State v. Richard P., 179 CA 676		74A
	<i>Sexual assault in fourth degree; risk of injury to child; whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss charges following entry of nolle prosequi as to charges after material child witnesses relocated with their mother to London, England, and would not be returning to United States and were beyond reach of state's power to compel their attendance at trial; claim that minor children had "become disabled" within meaning of statute (§ 54-56b); claim that § 54-56b should be interpreted to apply in circumstances where material witness is "unavailable"; claim that statutory phrase "has . . . become disabled" should be interpreted to include circumstances in which witness cannot be compelled to testify for reasons that extend beyond physical or mental disability of witness; claim that term "disappeared" in § 54-56b should be defined to mean absence from jurisdiction.</i>	

(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.

State *v.* Salmond, 179 CA 605 3A
Murder; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; whether trial court abused its discretion by allowing witness to make in-court identification of defendant; whether trial court's finding that state had proven reliability of in-court identification by clear and convincing evidence was supported by record; whether any alleged evidentiary error as to in-court identification by witness was harmless; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court should have granted request to charge and charged jury that out-of-court identification procedure was not substantive evidence of guilt due to its suggestiveness; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying request for special credibility instruction regarding testimony of witness; whether evidence supported finding that witness was involved in murder so as to warrant accomplice instruction; claim that trial court was required to give special credibility instruction with respect to testimony of witness because witness was akin to jailhouse informant.

Victor C. *v.* Commissioner of Correction, 179 CA 706 104A
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly denied petition for writ of habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly determined that trial counsel's decision not to present certain testimony did not constitute deficient performance; claim that habeas court improperly found that petitioner was not prejudiced by failure of trial counsel to advise him fully of right to testify and by counsel's having dissuaded him from testifying; claim that habeas court improperly determined that trial counsel did not render ineffective assistance by failing to consult expert on child sexual abuse or to present expert testimony in that regard.

Volume 179 Cumulative Table of Cases 125A

MISCELLANEOUS

Office of State Ethics Advisory Opinion 2B
 Notice of Application for Reinstatement to the Bar 1B
 Notice of Suspension of Attorney 1B