

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

---

VOL. LXXX No. 39                      March 26, 2019                      303 Pages

---

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Bank of America, National Assn. v. Liebskind (Order), 331 C 907 . . . . .	45
Costello v. Goldstein & Peck, P.C. (Order), 331 C 908 . . . . .	46
Federal National Mortgage Assn. v. Buhl (Order), 331 C 906 . . . . .	44
In re Tresin J. (Order), 331 C 909 . . . . .	47
Margarita O. v. Irazu (Order), 331 C 908 . . . . .	46
State v. Fernando V., 331 C 201 . . . . .	3
<i>Sexual assault second degree; risk of injury to child; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly determined that trial court had abused its discretion in precluding testimony of complainant's boyfriend regarding complainant's behavior on ground that such testimony was cumulative of other evidence presented at trial; reviewability of state's unpreserved claim that testimony of complainant's boyfriend was properly excluded; whether improper exclusion of witness' testimony was harmless error when case turned solely on credibility of complainant's testimony.</i>	
State v. Jones (Order), 331 C 909 . . . . .	47
State v. Joseph B. (Order), 331 C 908. . . . .	46
State v. Patel (Order), 331 C 906 . . . . .	44
Trocki v. Borusiewicz (Order), 331 C 907 . . . . .	45
Wethersfield v. PR Arrow, LLC (Order), 331 C 907 . . . . .	45
Volume 331 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	49

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Annulli v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 188 CA 902 . . . . .	228A
A1Z7, LLC v. Dombek, 188 CA 714 . . . . .	46A
<i>Unjust enrichment; application for prejudgment remedy; whether trial court properly concluded that statute (§ 47a-26b) awarding use and occupancy payments in summary process actions did not prohibit recovery of retroactive use and occupancy payments in separate action; claim that § 47a-26b provided exclusive remedy for recovery of use and occupancy payments; whether § 47a-26b contained exclusivity provision; whether plaintiff sought to recover reasonable value of premises occupied for past time period for which § 47a-26b would not permit award; whether permitting recovery for fair value of occupancy not covered by § 47a-26b that has unjustly enriched party occupying premises in separate action and to obtain security for judgment obtained in form of attachment or garnishment frustrated purposes of summary process statute to provide expeditious process for recovery of possession of premises; claim that prior pending action doctrine warranted dismissal of unjust enrichment action; whether claims in unjust enrichment and summary process actions were different; claim that doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel barred court from granting application for prejudgment remedy; whether application for prejudgment remedy required trial court to conduct full scale trial on merits.</i>	
De Almeida-Kennedy v. Kennedy, 188 CA 670 . . . . .	2A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; unallocated alimony and child support; whether trial court improperly denied in part motion for modification of unallocated alimony and child support obligation; claim that trial court abused its discretion by denying defendant's request to modify unallocated alimony and child support obligation without first making findings under child support guidelines; claim that trial</i>	

(continued on next page)

*court made erroneous factual finding; claim that trial court abused its discretion in finding that defendant failed to establish change in circumstances to warrant modification to unallocated alimony and child support obligation; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting in part motion for clarification and awarding plaintiff attorney's fees incurred defending defendant's motion for modification; whether record was adequate to review claim that trial court abused its discretion by granting motion for attorney's fees and expenses pending appeal.*

Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Grant (Memorandum Decision), 188 CA 901 . . . . . 227A

Fields v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 188 CA 902. . . . . 228A

Firstenberg v. Madigan, 188 CA 724. . . . . 56A

*Child custody; motion to intervene; third-party petition for visitation; claim that trial court incorrectly construed motion to intervene as seeking custody pursuant to statute (§ 46b-57), when motion sought visitation with minor child pursuant to statute (§ 46b-59 [b]); whether petition for visitation sufficiently alleged that paternal grandfather had parent-like relationship with minor child and that child would suffer real and significant harm if trial court denied visitation; whether trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over purported petition for visitation; whether trial court should have rendered judgment dismissing petition rather than denying it.*

In re Avia M., 188 CA 736 . . . . . 68A

*Termination of parental rights; whether trial court improperly concluded that petitioner, Commissioner of Children and Families, proved by clear and convincing evidence that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify respondent mother with child, that she was unable or unwilling to achieve requisite degree of personal rehabilitation and that it was in minor child's best interest to terminate her parental rights; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of applicable law on issues.*

Matthew C. v. Commissioner of Children & Families, 188 CA 687 . . . . . 19A

*Administrative appeal; child neglect; appeal from decision by defendant Commissioner of Children and Families denying request for hearing to challenge decision to substantiate allegations that plaintiff neglected his two minor children; claim that trial court improperly declined to equate certain provision (§ 22-12-4) of Policy Manual of Department of Children and Families, as derived from department regulation (§ 17a-101k-7), with doctrine of collateral estoppel; claim that trial court improperly decided administrative appeal on basis not decided by defendant's administrative hearing officer; claim that because hearing officer dismissed request for substantiation hearing only on basis of collateral estoppel, court was not permitted to consider applicability of § 22-12-4 of policy manual; claim that trial court was limited to considering same conclusions of law that administrative body reached; whether trial court properly determined that department regulation and policy manual provision were not substantively identical to common-law doctrine of collateral estoppel and that it was proper to apply them; whether trial court properly applied applicable regulation rather than common-law doctrine in evaluating request for hearing; claim that trial court improperly*

(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](http://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.

*dismissed request for substantiation hearing; whether dismissal of request for substantiation hearing pursuant to department regulation violated plaintiff's right to fundamental fairness.*

Melendez v. Spin Cycle Laundromat, LLC, 188 CA 807 . . . . . 139A  
*Negligence; whether trial court properly denied motion to set aside verdict; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.*

State v. Simmons, 188 CA 813 . . . . . 145A  
*Assault in first degree; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; carrying pistol without permit; whether state's promise to witness of immunity from prosecution for any perjury witness might commit in his testimony plainly violated strong public policy reflected in statutory (§ 54-47a [b]) prohibition against immunizing perjured testimony and undermined perception of and confidence in system of justice; whether state's improper grant of immunity to witness warranted exercise of Appellate Court's supervisory authority over due administration of justice; whether dearth of authority on question of whether grant of immunity constituted structural error and Appellate Court's practice of not deciding thorny constitutional questions when possible made it unnecessary to decide whether defendant's constitutional rights were violated by improper immunity agreement or whether structural error doctrine was applicable; whether Appellate Court's exercise of supervisory powers over administration of justice to remand case for new trial made it unnecessary to resolve difficult and close question of whether defendant was harmed by witness' testimony; whether Appellate Court's exercise of supervisory powers over administration of justice was warranted because state's improper immunity agreement with witness gave witness license to commit perjury and directly implicated perception of integrity of justice system; claim that Appellate Court's exercise of supervisory authority to reverse conviction was improper; claim that it was unclear that Appellate Court has supervisory power over administration of justice; claim that defendant at trial waived any challenge to improper immunity agreement.*

Thomas v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 188 CA 902. . . . . 228A  
 Volume 188 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 229A

**NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES**

DEEP—Notice of Adopted Stream Flow Classifications . . . . . 1B  
 Dept. of Social Services—Notices of Proposed Medicaid State Plan Amendment . . . . . 2B

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Division of Criminal Justice—Notice of Job Opportunity . . . . . 1C  
 Notice of Suspension of Attorney . . . . . 3C