

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 36 March 5, 2019 257 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Jacobson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 331 C 901	59
Rivera v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 331 C 901.	59
State v. Daniel B., 331 C 1	3
<i>Attempt to commit murder; certification from Appellate Court; sufficiency of evidence; whether Appellate Court properly construed substantial step subdivision of attempt statute (§ 53a-49 [a] [2]) to require inquiry to focus on what already has been done rather than on what remains to be done to complete the substantive crime in determining whether defendant's conduct constituted substantial step in course of conduct planned to culminate in his commission of murder.</i>	
State v. Santiago (Order), 331 C 902	60
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Wolf (Order), 331 C 901.	59
Volume 331 Cumulative Table of Cases	61

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Cadco, Ltd. v. Doctor's Associates, Inc., 188 CA 122	2A
<i>Summary judgment; alleged violations of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); whether trial court properly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact that defendants' conduct did not amount to unfair act or practice in violation of CUTPA; whether plaintiff's claims met any prong of cigarette rule for determining whether practice violates CUTPA; whether trial court properly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether defendants' conduct constituted deceptive act or practice under CUTPA; whether there was evidence of any misrepresentation, omission, or practice by defendants likely to mislead plaintiff; whether defendants were under duty to inform plaintiff regarding bid solicitation; whether trial court erred in concluding that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether defendants were unjustly enriched to plaintiff's detriment; whether there was evidence that defendants did not compensate plaintiff fully for benefit received.</i>	
Cruz v. Schoenhorn, 188 CA 208	88A
<i>Legal malpractice; summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motions for summary judgment; whether plaintiff's action was brought within applicable statute of limitations (§ 52-577); claim that trial court erred in not considering plaintiff's affidavit in adjudicating motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court misconstrued argument of plaintiff as to date that attorney-client relationship with defendants ended.</i>	
In re Bianca K., 188 CA 259	139A
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court erred in concluding that respondent mother failed to achieve requisite degree of personal rehabilitation required by statute (§ 17a-112 [j] [3] [B] [i]); whether trial court improperly determined that termination of parental rights was in best interest of minor child.</i>	
In re Probate Appeal of Kusmit, 188 CA 196.	76A
<i>Probate appeal; appeal by plaintiff coadministrators of estate of decedent to trial court from decision of Probate Court allocating distribution of certain disputed attorney's fees; whether this court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over appeal; whether plaintiffs lacked standing to challenge judgment of trial court; whether plaintiffs were classically aggrieved by judgment of trial court.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Juan G. v. Commissioner of Correction, 188 CA 241 121A
Habeas corpus; risk reduction earned credit; whether habeas court improperly dismissed claim that retroactive revocation of petitioner's risk reduction earned credits violated ex post facto clause of United States constitution; motion for summary reversal of habeas court's dismissal of petition for writ of habeas corpus with respect to petitioner's ex post facto claim; whether appeal was controlled by Breton v. Commissioner of Correction (330 Conn. 462).

MacCalla v. American Medical Response of Connecticut, Inc., 188 CA 228 108A
Promissory estoppel; motion for nonsuit; claim that trial court erred in dismissing plaintiffs' case solely on basis of conduct of plaintiffs' counsel at depositions; claim that trial court erred in dismissing claim of one plaintiff individually who had complied with discovery obligations and was not named in motion for nonsuit; whether actions of plaintiffs' counsel at plaintiffs' depositions were unprofessional and unacceptable; whether defendant sought sanctions solely based on conduct of plaintiffs' counsel.

Mitchell v. State, 188 CA 245. 125A
Petition for new trial; attempt to commit murder; conspiracy to commit murder; kidnapping in first degree; conspiracy to commit kidnapping in first degree; sexual assault in first degree; conspiracy to commit sexual assault in first degree; assault in first degree; conspiracy to commit assault in first degree; criminal possession of firearm; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying request for leave to file late petition for certification to appeal from denial of petition for new trial; whether state or court are required to provide petitioner with written notice of appeal procedures and statutory certification requirement; claim that trial court improperly denied request for leave to file late petition for certification on basis of merits of appeal; whether trial court afforded due regard to reasons for delay in filing request.

Parnoff v. Aquarian Water Co. of Connecticut (AC 40383), 188 CA 153 33A
Trespass; negligent infliction of emotional distress; intentional infliction of emotional distress; invasion of privacy; violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); summary judgment; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to trespass claims because defendants use of certain easement on plaintiff's property was unreasonable; whether trespass claims were moot; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment as to negligent infliction of emotional distress claims; whether trial court properly determined that negligent infliction of emotional distress claims were barred by applicable two year statute of limitations (§ 52-584); whether continuing course of conduct doctrine tolled statute of limitations; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to invasion of privacy by intrusion on seclusion claims; whether alleged tortious conduct of defendants established claim of intrusion of seclusion; whether plaintiff proved intentional intrusion on his solitude or seclusion that would be highly offensive to reasonable person; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to intentional infliction of emotional distress claims;

(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.

whether defendants' conduct was sufficiently extreme and outrageous to form basis for intentional infliction of emotional distress claim; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment in favor of defendant water company as to CUTPA claim; whether plaintiff failed to allege and demonstrate that he suffered ascertainable loss; whether punitive damages and attorney's fees are sufficient to fulfill ascertainable loss requirement under CUTPA; whether emotional distress constitutes ascertainable loss of money or property for purposes of CUTPA.

Parnoff v. Aquarian Water Co. of Connecticut (AC 40109), 188 CA 145 25A
False arrest; violation of federal law (42 U.S.C. § 1983); reviewability of claims challenging trial court's granting of motion for summary judgment on basis of distinctly different theory from theory plaintiff argued before trial court and on which trial court actually rendered summary judgment.

Rivera v. Patient Care of Connecticut, 188 CA 203 83A
Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner approving request to transfer plaintiff's benefit status from temporary partial disability to permanent partial disability on basis of medical examination that determined that plaintiff had reached maximum medical improvement; claim that commissioner failed to require defendant to prove that plaintiff had work capacity; claim that commissioner improperly shifted burden to plaintiff to prove she did not have work capacity.

Ross v. Commissioner of Correction, 188 CA 251. 131A
Habeas corpus; murder; carrying pistol or revolver without permit; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to call toxicologist as expert witness to present adequate intoxication defense; claim that trial counsel's failure to object to improprieties in prosecutor's closing arguments constituted ineffective assistance; whether trial counsel's decision not to present expert witness to testify about effects of drugs petitioner ingested was reasonable trial strategy; whether habeas court properly determined that trial counsel was not ineffective in failing to object to improprieties in prosecutor's closing arguments; whether collateral estoppel precluded relitigation of issue that was addressed and decided in petitioner's direct appeal.

Stanley v. Scott (Memorandum Decision), 188 CA 901 157A
 Strano v. Azzinaro, 188 CA 183 63A
Intentional infliction of emotional distress; whether trial court properly granted motion to strike revised complaint alleging claims of intentional infliction of emotional distress; whether defendants' alleged conduct toward plaintiffs was extreme and outrageous.

Volume 188 Cumulative Table of Cases 159A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

CHEAF—Notice of Intent to Adopt Operating Procedures 1C
 Dept. of Housing—Affordable Housing Notices 1C, 2C
 State Elections Enforcement Commission, Declaratory Ruling 2019-01 3C
 State Elections Enforcement Commission, Resolution and Order—Proposed Declaratory Ruling 2019-02. 11C,12C

MISCELLANEOUS

Division of Criminal Justice—Notices of Job Opportunities 1D
 Notice of Reprimand of Attorneys 7D
 Notice of Suspension of Attorney 7D