

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 38

March 19, 2019

362 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Soto v. Bushmaster Firearms International, LLC, 331 C 53	3
<i>Wrongful death action pursuant to statute (§ 52-555) against defendant manufacturers, distributors, and sellers of semiautomatic rifle used in school shooting; claim that defendants negligently entrusted to civilian consumers assault rifle that is suitable for use only by military and law enforcement personnel; claim that defendants violated Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.) through sale or wrongful marketing of rifle; motion to strike plaintiffs' complaint; claim that all of plaintiffs' claims were barred by Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act (PLCAA) (15 U.S.C. §§ 7901 through 7903 [2012]); whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiffs did not plead legally sufficient cause of action based on negligent entrustment under state common law; whether trial court improperly struck plaintiffs' claims under CUTPA on ground that plaintiffs lacked standing because they were third-party victims who did not have consumer or commercial relationship with defendants; claim that prudential concerns supported restriction of CUTPA standing to persons who have direct business relationship with alleged wrongdoer; whether statute of limitations applicable to wrongful death claims or whether statute of limitations applicable to CUTPA claims applied to cause of action for wrongful death predicated on CUTPA violation; whether plaintiffs' wrongful death claims predicated on theory that any sale of military style assault weapons, such as rifle in question, represented unfair trade practice were time barred; whether plaintiffs' wrongful death claims predicated on theory that defendants violated CUTPA by advertising and marketing rifle in unethical, oppressive, immoral, and unscrupulous manner were time barred; claim, as alternative ground for affirming trial court's judgment, that exclusivity provision of Connecticut Product Liability Act (§ 52-572n [a]) barred plaintiffs' CUTPA claims that were predicated on defendants' allegedly wrongful advertising and marketing of rifle; whether personal injuries resulting in death that are alleged to have resulted directly from wrongful advertising and marketing practices are cognizable under CUTPA; whether PLCAA barred plaintiffs' wrongful death claims predicated on theory that defendants violated CUTPA by marketing rifle in question to civilians for criminal purposes; whether trial court correctly concluded that CUTPA, as applied to plaintiffs' allegations, fell within PLCAA's "predicate" exception to immunity for civil actions alleging that firearms manufacturer or seller knowingly violated state or federal statute "applicable" to "sale or marketing" of firearms, and violation was proximate cause of harm for which relief was sought; review of text of predicate exception and legislative history of PLCAA to determine whether Congress intended to preclude actions alleging that firearms manufacturer or seller violated state consumer protection laws by promoting its firearms for illegal, criminal purposes; whether CUTPA qualified as predicate statute under PLCAA insofar as it applied to wrongful advertising and marketing claims; whether congressional statement of findings and purposes set forth in PLCAA lent support for this court's conclusion that Congress did not intend PLCAA to preclude plaintiffs' wrongful advertising and marketing claims brought pursuant to CUTPA; whether construing statute of general applicability such as CUTPA to be predicate statute would lead to absurd results; whether extrinsic indicia of congressional intent supported conclusion that CUTPA, as applied to plaintiffs' claims, qualified as predicate statute under PLCAA.</i>	151
Volume 331 Cumulative Table of Cases	151

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Andrade v. Lego Systems, Inc., 188 CA 652 174A
Employment discrimination; claim that defendant discriminated against plaintiff on basis of sexual orientation in violation of statute (§ 46a-60 [a] [1]); summary judgment; whether trial court properly determined that there was insufficient evidence from which reasonable jury could conclude that circumstances surrounding termination of plaintiff's employment could give rise to inference of discrimination; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.

Nappo v. Nappo, 188 CA 574. 96A
Dissolution of marriage; motion for contempt; motion for modification; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting motion for modification and increasing defendant's alimony payments; whether trial court, in calculating amount of alimony, erroneously found increase in defendant's weekly net income; whether trial court correctly determined that financial contributions to defendant from his current wife constituted gifts rather than loans; claim that modified alimony award was excessive; whether trial court's failure to attribute certain rental income to plaintiff was clearly erroneous; reviewability of claim that it was unfair for trial court to award plaintiff attorney's fees and travel expenses as sanction; whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering defendant to commence paying interest on plaintiff's share of certain bond proceeds if bond was not released on or before certain date; whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering defendant to reimburse plaintiff for certain bank wire transfer charges; whether remedial order was proper even though defendant's violation of court's alimony order was not wilful because it compensated plaintiff for minor alimony deficiency.

Smalls v. Commissioner of Correction, 188 CA 525. 47A
Habeas corpus; murder; risk of injury to child; criminal possession of firearm; claim that prior habeas counsel was ineffective for failing to raise claim that petitioner's trial counsel was ineffective for failing to fully explain plea offer to petitioner; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner failed to establish deficient performance by trial counsel or prior habeas counsel; whether habeas court correctly determined that petitioner was not prejudiced by any alleged deficient performance of trial counsel or prior habeas counsel.

State v. Dawson, 188 CA 532. 54A
Criminal possession of pistol or revolver; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support defendant's conviction of criminal possession of pistol or revolver because there was insufficient evidence of defendant's knowledge of gun and no evidence to prove his dominion or control over it; claim that state improperly relied on DNA evidence alone to prove that defendant knew of gun's presence and where it was located; claim that DNA evidence was insufficient due to questionable reliability of testing small sample; claim that even if state produced sufficient evidence that defendant knew of gun's presence, it failed to adduce any evidence

(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.

of his intent to exercise dominion or control of gun; claim that defendant was deprived of his constitutional right to fair trial as result of prosecutorial improprieties during closing argument; whether prosecutor's incomplete and incorrect statement of law of constructive possession deprived defendant of his right to fair trial; claim that state mischaracterized DNA evidence and improperly suggested that there was no evidence to support defense's theory that his DNA on gun or ammunition came to be there in some incidental or accidental fashion.

State v. Dunbar, 188 CA 635 157A
Violation of probation; claim that there was insufficient evidence for trial court to find that defendant violated her probation; credibility of witnesses; reviewability of unpreserved claim that defendant's right to due process was violated because trial court failed to conduct analysis of reliability of out-of-court identification of defendant pursuant to Neil v. Biggers (409 U.S. 188); failure to provide adequate record for review; reviewability of unpreserved claim that defendant's due process right to confront adverse witness was violated because trial court failed to balance defendant's interest in confronting confidential informant against state's reasons for not producing informant at hearing and reliability of proffered hearsay; whether record was inadequate to review unpreserved due process claim because defendant failed to request that trial court conduct balancing test pursuant to State v. Shakir (130 Conn. App. 458).

State v. Hutton, 188 CA 481 3A
Murder; whether trial court violated defendant's right to confrontation when it admitted into evidence, pursuant to State v. Whelan (200 Conn. 743), witness' prior videotaped statement to police in which witness identified defendant as shooter; whether witness' refusal to provide any verbal responses to counsels' questions rendered witness functionally unavailable to testify; claim that defendant lacked any meaningful opportunity to cross-examine witness and to expose infirmities in videotaped statement or reasons behind witness' recalcitrance or lack of memory; whether erroneous admission of videotaped statement was harmless beyond reasonable doubt.

State v. Weathers, 188 CA 600 122A
Murder; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; carrying pistol without permit; whether trial court's rejection of affirmative defense of mental disease or defect was reasonably supported by evidence; claim that trial court erred as matter of law in deciding issue without aid of expert testimony; claim that trial court improperly rejected testimony of defendant's experts; whether trial court was entitled to adopt nonpsychiatric explanation for defendant's conduct; whether trial court reasonably could have found that evidence pertaining to expert's understanding of statutory insanity test undermined value of expert's opinions; whether trial court reasonably could have found that expert failed to account adequately for defendant's statements to police; whether trial court's express subordinate factual findings were clearly erroneous.

Volume 188 Cumulative Table of Cases 193A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Connecticut Port Authority—Notice of Intent to Adopt SHIPP Policies and Procedures. . . 1B
DEEP—Notice of Availability of Long Island Sound Blue Plan 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Suspension of Attorney 1C
Notice of Reprimand of Attorneys 2C
Division of Criminal Justice—Notice of Job Opportunity 3C