

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 37 March 12, 2019 229 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Becue v. Becue (Order), 331 C 902	2
Boria v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 331 C 902	2
Boucher v. Saint Francis GI Endoscopy, LLC (Order), 331 C 905.	5
Buie v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 331 C 905	5
Cannatelli v. Statewide Grievance Committee (Order), 331 C 903	3
Citibank, N.A., Trustee v. Stein (Order), 331 C 903	3
CitiMortgage, Inc. v. Pritchard (Order), 331 C 906	6
Fingelly v. Fairfield (Order), 331 C 904.	4
Gabriel v. Mount Vernon Fire Ins. Co. (Order), 331 C 903.	3
Ham v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 331 C 904.	4
Karagozian v. USV Optical, Inc. (Order), 331 C 904.	4
Volume 331 Cumulative Table of Cases	7

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of New York Mellon v. Ruttkamp, 188 CA 365	93A
<i>Foreclosure; claim that trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction due to plaintiff's lack of standing; claim that plaintiff brought this action under its corporate brand name and, thus, did not have legal capacity to sue; whether defendant effectively abandoned claim concerning plaintiff's alleged lack of standing; whether plaintiff is legal entity with legal capacity to sue; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of plaintiff on counterclaim; failure to brief claim adequately.</i>	
Betts v. Commissioner of Correction, 188 CA 397	125A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether criminal trial counsel provided ineffective assistance; claim that petitioner's criminal trial counsel did not give adequate advice concerning state's pretrial plea offer; whether habeas court correctly determined that petitioner failed to establish that he was not advised of maximum penalties for pending charges or of maximum exposure to punishment if found guilty on all charges; whether habeas court correctly concluded that trial counsel advised petitioner as to maximum possible penalties for all felony charges he faced; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to advise petitioner adequately as to strength of state's case; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner was not prejudiced by trial counsel's allegedly inadequate advice in connection with state's pretrial plea offer.</i>	
Deroy v. Reck, 188 CA 292.	20A
<i>Legal malpractice; will execution; testamentary capacity; breach of fiduciary duty; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment on ground that plaintiff failed to provide expert testimony concerning applicable standard of care and defendants' alleged breach thereof; claim that requirement of expert testimony was obviated because defendants' conduct demonstrated such obvious and gross want of care and skill that neglect was clear even to layperson.</i>	
Doe v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services, 188 CA 275	3A
<i>Patients' bill of rights (§ 17a-540 et seq.); alleged violations of patients' bill of rights in connection with named plaintiff's treatment and confinement at defendant forensic psychiatric hospital; whether trial court properly concluded that civil commitment of named plaintiff, as only woman in otherwise all male maximum security unit at hospital, was not per se violation of patients' bill of rights; whether</i>	

(continued on next page)

patients' bill of rights mandates that committed patients be subject to categorical gender segregation; whether imposition of per se rule would be inconsistent with purpose of patients' bill of rights; claim that trial court improperly applied standard outlined in Mahoney v. Lensink (213 Conn. 548) to determine that defendants' treatment of named plaintiff while she was committed to maximum security unit did not violate her right to humane and dignified treatment under § 17a-542; whether Mahoney makes clear that right to specialized treatment plan is part of, and not severable from, right to humane and dignified treatment; whether defendants' treatment plan was permissible and reasonable.

Garcia v. Cohen, 188 CA 380. 108A

Negligence; premises liability; whether general verdict rule precluded review of claim that trial court improperly rejected request to charge jury that possessor of real property has nondelegable duty to maintain premises in reasonably safe condition.

In re Malachi E., 188 CA 426. 154A

Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court erred with respect to dispositional phase of proceedings when it improperly determined that termination of respondent mother's parental rights was in best interest of child; claim that trial court improperly relied entirely on its adjudicatory determination that mother had failed to achieve sufficient personal rehabilitation in determining whether termination of parental rights was in best interest of child; whether trial court's best interest determination was clearly erroneous; whether there was evidence presented to support trial court's determination that termination of parental rights was in best interest of child.

Lopes v. Ferrari, 188 CA 387. 115A

Child custody; motion for psychological evaluation; claim that trial court abused its discretion when it denied motion for psychological evaluation of defendant; whether plaintiff set forth any facts to substantiate reasons for psychological evaluation; claim that trial court's custody determination did not comply with applicable statutes (§§ 46b-56 and 46b-56a [b]); whether trial court articulated basis of decision; whether it was clear from trial court's decision that it considered § 46b-56 and child's best interests; whether plaintiff met burden to request trial court to further articulate its reasoning or best interests determination; claim that, by giving defendant final decision-making authority, trial court essentially gave defendant sole custody.

Manzo-III v. Schoonmaker, 188 CA 343. 71A

Legal malpractice; fraudulent misrepresentation; motion to reargue; whether trial court properly concluded that action was barred by applicable statute of limitations (§ 52-577); whether statute of limitations was tolled pursuant to doctrine of continuous representation; claim that trial court misapplied rule in DeLeo v. Nusbaum (263 Conn. 588) regarding continuous representation doctrine and tolling of statute of limitations; whether trial court properly concluded that attorney-client relationship between plaintiff and defendant law firm ended on certain date; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to reargue.

(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.

Miller v. Board of Education, 188 CA 373 101A
Quantum meruit; unjust enrichment; motion to dismiss; accidental failure of suit statute (§ 52-592 [a]); whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss action as untimely; whether plaintiff brought action for same cause within one year following determination of prior original action, as required under § 52-592.

State v. Gonzalez, 188 CA 304 32A
Home invasion; sexual assault in first degree; risk of injury to child; whether there was sufficient evidence to support conviction of home invasion; whether trial court properly denied motion for judgment of acquittal on count of home invasion; claim that defendant was entitled to new trial because he was deprived of constitutional rights to fair trial and to be heard by counsel at close of evidence; claim that format of prosecutor's closing argument to jury was improper; reviewability of claim that prosecutor improperly raised new issues and mischaracterized DNA and fingerprint evidence during rebuttal argument to jury; claim that defendant was prejudiced by prosecutor's comment to jury that fingerprints on window could have been there for 100 years; unpreserved claim that defendant was entitled to new trial because his counsel was not given opportunity to counter prosecutor's statement in her rebuttal argument to jury that defendant was only person in Connecticut who could have been contributor to certain mixture of DNA; claim that defendant was entitled to new trial on charge of home invasion because prosecutor misled jury during closing argument about elements of that crime.

State v. Gray-Brown, 188 CA 446 174A
Felony murder; robbery in first degree; carrying pistol without permit; whether trial court properly denied motion to suppress evidence police seized during search of defendant's bedroom; whether trial court's findings that defendant's mother had actual authority to consent to search and whether her consent was voluntary were clearly erroneous; claim that defendant established sufficiently exclusive control of bedroom so as to render ineffective mother's consent to search; whether trial court reasonably concluded that evidence police seized from defendant's bedroom was relevant and that its probative value outweighed any undue prejudice; whether evidence was sufficient to prove that firearm used in shooting had barrel less than twelve inches in length, which was required to sustain conviction of carrying pistol without permit in violation of statute (§ 29-35 [a]); whether trial court properly determined that defendant was not entitled to jury instruction on third-party culpability; whether defendant established direct connection between third party and offense with which defendant was charged; whether trial court abused its discretion when it declined to question juror, who had been dismissed after jury returned verdict, about claim that juror became aware that defendant was incarcerated when juror allegedly saw defendant being transported to court by correctional officer.

State v. Ruiz, 188 CA 413 141A
Violation of probation; motion to suppress; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress one-on-one showup identification; whether trial court properly found that identification procedure was not unnecessarily suggestive; claim that trial court improperly found that defendant violated condition of his probation; whether there was sufficient evidence to support trial court's finding that defendant committed act of threatening in second degree in violation of statute (§ 53a-62 [a] [1]); claim that trial court abused its discretion in revoking defendant's probation.

Volume 188 Cumulative Table of Cases 209A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Dept. of Social Services—Notices of Proposed Medicaid State Plan Amendments 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Reprimand of Attorney 1C
Notice Vacating Suspensions of Attorney 1C