

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 40

April 2, 2019

238 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Anderson v. Dike (Order), 331 C 910 . . . . .	84
Connecticut Community Bank, N.A. v. Kiernan (Order), 331 C 911 . . . . .	85
Gould v. Stamford, 331 C 289 . . . . .	53
<i>Workers' compensation; single-member limited liability companies; denial and dismissal of claim for concurrent employment benefits pursuant to provision (§ 31-310) of Workers' Compensation Act (§ 31-275 et seq.) by Workers' Compensation Commissioner; appeal to Compensation Review Board; board's affirmance of commissioner's decision; whether board, in upholding commissioner's decision, properly reasoned that, because limited liability company of which plaintiff was only member allegedly did not maintain appropriate corporate formalities, its status as limited liability company had to be disregarded; whether chairman of Workers' Compensation Commission had authority to adopt conclusive presumption that members of single-member limited liability companies are not their employees for purposes of act; whether board incorrectly concluded that plaintiff was not employee of limited liability company and, therefore, was not entitled to concurrent employment benefits pursuant to § 31-310.</i>	
State v. Brown, 331 C 258 . . . . .	22
<i>Burglary; larceny; conspiracy; attempt; criminal mischief; criminal trover; possession of burglar tools; motions to suppress; motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss on basis of its conclusion that state obtained defendant's prospective and historical cell phone data from his telecommunications carrier in violation of statute ([Rev. to 2009] § 54-47aa); application of fourth amendment principles relating to disclosure of certain cell phone data set forth in United States Supreme Court's decision in Carpenter v. United States (138 S. Ct. 2206), discussed; whether suppression of cell phone data was appropriate remedy when records were obtained in violation of defendant's fourth amendment rights and in violation of § 54-47aa; whether good faith exception to exclusionary rule was applicable to unconstitutional disclosure of historical cell phone data; whether trial court correctly determined that state failed to meet its burden of proving that inevitable discovery doctrine was applicable, under facts of case, to witness' statement to police and potential trial testimony implicating defendant in charged crimes.</i>	
State v. Bumgarner-Ramos (Order), 331 C 910 . . . . .	84
State v. Davis, 331 C 239 . . . . .	3
<i>Criminal possession of pistol; carrying pistol without permit; conditional plea of nolo contendere; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to suppress handgun that gave rise to charges against defendant; whether anonymous 911 call in which caller claimed to have seen young man with handgun was sufficient to give rise to reasonable suspicion that defendant had been engaged in criminal activity; factors for determining whether anonymous tip has sufficient indicia of reliability under Navarette v. California (572 U.S. 393), discussed.</i>	
State v. Juarez (Order), 331 C 910 . . . . .	84
Volume 331 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	87

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Cohen v. King, 189 CA 85 . . . . .	87A
<i>Defamation; fraud; absolute immunity; litigation privilege; motion to dismiss; claim that trial court improperly concluded that doctrine of litigation privilege barred</i>	

(continued on next page)

<i>action against defendant attorney based on allegedly defamatory and false statements made by defendant in answer to grievance complaint filed by plaintiff against defendant; whether trial court properly concluded that litigation privilege extends absolute immunity to statements made to attorney disciplinary authority by attorney who was subject of grievance complaint; claim that litigation privilege did not apply because complaint pleads facts suggesting that defendant abused judicial process and breached professional duty of candor.</i>	
Countrywide Home Loans Servicing, LP v. Pires (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 903 . . . . .	131A
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Siladi (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 902 . . . . .	130A
Garden Homes Profit Sharing Trust, L.P. v. Cyr, 189 CA 75 . . . . .	77A
<i>Summary process; nonjoinder of party; whether trial court had authority to raise, sua sponte, issue of nonjoinder of necessary party in absence of motion to strike filed by defendant; whether trial court improperly rendered judgment in favor of defendant on basis of nonjoinder without giving plaintiff opportunity to add necessary party to action in violation of relevant statute (§ 52-108) and rules of practice (§§ 9-19 and 10-44).</i>	
Harris v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 903 . . . . .	131A
Harvey v. Dept. of Correction, 189 CA 93 . . . . .	95A
<i>Wrongful death; sovereign immunity; claim that trial court improperly granted motion to dismiss action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether action was time barred pursuant to statute (§ 4-160 [d]) that requires plaintiff who has been granted authorization to sue state by Claims Commissioner to bring action within one year from date authorization was granted; claim that action was not untimely because applicable statute of limitations (§ 52-555) for wrongful death action, which permits action to be brought within two years from date of decedent's death, had not expired and is not limited by § 4-160 (d); whether plaintiff was required to comply with both one year limitation period provided in § 4-160 (d) and statute of limitations for wrongful death action set forth in § 52-555; claim that action was timely because limitation period prescribed in § 4-160 (d) was extended by statute (§ 52-594).</i>	
Holbrook v. Commissioner of Correction, 189 CA 108 . . . . .	110A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly denied petition for writ of habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner failed to prove that prior habeas counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to pursue claim that trial counsel had been ineffective; claim that trial counsel's decision not to call witness constituted deficient performance; claim that prosecution suppressed favorable evidence when it delayed making plea offer to eyewitness until after eyewitness testified in petitioner's criminal trial.</i>	
Ibrahim v. Chapdelaine (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 901 . . . . .	129A
Ion Bank v. J.C.C. Custom Homes, LLC, 189 CA 30 . . . . .	32A
<i>Replevin; action by way of replevin to recover certain collateral in defendants' possession; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motion to dismiss because amended complaint filed by plaintiff cured any defect regarding plaintiff's standing; claim that plaintiff properly substituted proper party as plaintiff by</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 <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.

*operation of law by filing amended complaint in compliance with relevant rule of practice (§ 10-59); whether plaintiff was required to file motion for permission to substitute proper party as plaintiff; whether trial court abused its discretion in declining to treat amended complaint as motion to substitute parties; claim that plaintiff, as assignor of note, had standing to maintain replevin action on behalf of its assignee.*

Lively v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 901 . . . . .	129A
Marino v. Statewide Grievance Committee, 189 CA 7 . . . . .	9A
<i>Attorney discipline; appeal to trial court from decision of reviewing committee of defendant Statewide Grievance Committee finding that plaintiff violated rule 4.4 (a) of Rules of Professional Conduct; whether trial court's decision that defendant properly concluded that plaintiff violated rule 4.4 (a) was based on clear and convincing evidence; whether there was clear and convincing proof that plaintiff filed motion for <i>habeas corpus</i> for no substantial purpose other than to embarrass or burden complainant; whether there is statutory authority or rule of practice that requires attorney to contact court or to check judicial website prior to filing motion for <i>habeas corpus</i>; whether motion for <i>habeas corpus</i> may properly be requested when party is served with subpoena <i>duces tecum</i> and fails to appear for scheduled deposition; whether rule 4.4 (a) imposes additional obligations on attorney when dealing with self-represented party.</i>	
McKiernan v. Civil Service Commission, 189 CA 50 . . . . .	52A
<i>Declaratory judgment; action seeking declaratory judgment that plaintiff be allowed to retake oral assessment portion of certain police detective promotional examination; claim that trial court erred by rendering judgment in favor of defendants on basis of its finding that oral assessment was administered in accordance with requirements of city charter; whether trial court's finding that test administrators provided plaintiff with all necessary test materials for oral assessment was clearly erroneous; whether trial court's finding that supervising test administrator's description of procedures followed during examination was corroborated by other witnesses was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court erred in concluding that examination was administered in reasonable manner even though test administrators failed to take any steps to provide plaintiff with allegedly missing test materials; whether oral assessment was given in compliance with requirements of city charter despite lack of system to keep track of test materials; claim that examination was unreasonable and arbitrary because it was not administered in uniform manner; claim that instructions given to test participants on video in assessment room were different from those set forth in documents given in preparation room.</i>	
Premier Capital, LLC v. Shaw, 189 CA 1 . . . . .	3A
<i>Standing; action to enforce judgment; whether trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction due to plaintiff's lack of standing; whether designation of wrong entity as plaintiff was scrivener's error; whether trial court should have dismissed case rather than deciding it on merits.</i>	
Saint Francis Hospital & Medical Center v. Malley, 189 CA 68 . . . . .	70A
<i>Default judgment; default for failure to appear; claim that rendering of default judgment was improper and constituted plain error; whether it was improper to enter default against defendant for failure to appear where defendant's counsel was present in court; whether consequences of court's error were so grievous as to be fundamentally unfair or manifestly unjust; whether unwarranted rendering of default judgment against defendant was likely to undermine public confidence in judiciary.</i>	
Simpson v. Lee (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 901 . . . . .	129A
State v. Bischoff, 189 CA 119 . . . . .	121A
<i>Possession of narcotics; possession of less than four ounces of cannabis-type substance; motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that 2015 amendment of statute applicable to possession of narcotics (§ 21a-279 [a]) applied retroactively and entitled defendant to resentencing on conviction of possession of narcotics; whether this court is bound by precedent from our Supreme Court; whether trial court should have rendered judgment denying rather than dismissing motion to correct illegal sentence.</i>	
Taing v. CAMRAC, LLC, 189 CA 23 . . . . .	25A
<i>Employment discrimination; pregnancy discrimination; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment in favor of defendant; claim that genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether defendant's proffered reason for terminating plaintiff's employment was pretextual.</i>	
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Rago (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 902 . . . . .	130A
Vazzano v. Reveron (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 902 . . . . .	130A
Volume 189 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	133A

**SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES**

Summaries . . . . . 1B

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Division of Criminal Justice—Notice of Job Opportunity . . . . . 1C  
Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel . . . . . 3C  
Notice of Suspension of Attorney . . . . . 3C  
Notice of Resignation of Attorney . . . . . 3C  
CT Supreme Ct. Policies for the Establishment & Maintenance of a System of Law Libraries 4C

---