

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 44 April 30, 2019 215 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Andrade v. Lego Systems, Inc. (Order), 331 C 921	45
Betts v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 331 C 919	43
Board of Education v. New Milford Education Assn., 331 C 524	2
<i>Arbitration; application to vacate arbitration award; application to confirm arbitration award; claim that plaintiff board of education violated terms of parties' collective bargaining agreement; whether trial court correctly concluded that arbitrator did not manifestly disregard law in finding that claims raised in grievance were not barred under doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel in light of prior interest arbitration; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that grievance was arbitrable.</i>	
Garcia v. Cohen (Order), 331 C 921.	45
Mitchell v. State (Order), 331 C 920.	44
Newland v. Commissioner of Correction, 331 C 546	24
<i>Habeas corpus; whether petitioner's claims regarding violation of constitutional right to counsel were barred by procedural default; whether, for purpose of standard set forth in Wainwright v. Sykes (433 U.S. 72), prejudice may be presumed from complete denial of counsel; importance of right to counsel in criminal proceedings, discussed.</i>	
Smalls v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 331 C 920.	44
State v. Gray-Brown (Order), 331 C 922	46
State v. Tyson (Order), 331 C 919.	43
Volume 331 Cumulative Table of Cases	47

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of America, N.A. v. Grogins, 189 CA 477	3A
<i>Foreclosure; default for failure to disclose defense; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to open judgment of strict foreclosure; whether defendants established good cause to open judgment that was not based wholly on merits of judgment of strict foreclosure; whether trial court improperly considered defendants' negligence in determining whether there was good cause to open judgment; whether statute (§ 49-15) governing opening of judgments of strict foreclosure required defendants to demonstrate that they were prevented from making their defenses by mistake, accident, or other reasonable cause.</i>	
Bank of America, N.A. v. Linkasamy (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 904	138A
Benjamin v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 905.	139A
Boyle v. Apple Hill Homeowners Assn., Inc. (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 905	139A

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK

Notice of Public Hearing on Proposed Practice Book Revisions appears beginning on Page 1PB. The proposed revisions were published in the Law Journal of April 23, 2019, and are posted on the Judicial Branch website at: www.jud.ct.gov/pb.htm.

Brewer v. Commissioner of Correction, 189 CA 556 82A
Habeas corpus; murder; criminal possession of firearm; claim that first habeas counsel was ineffective in failing to claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to consult with forensic pathology expert; claim that first habeas counsel was ineffective in failing to object to admission of prior inconsistent statements from two witnesses; whether, after consulting with expert criminalist, trial counsel was required to search for another expert to perform crime scene reconstruction; whether jury had before it same evidence that would have been revealed by expert forensic pathologist; whether trial counsel's decision not to object to admission of statements was reasonable strategic decision.

Burg v. Northeast Specialty Corp. (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 904 138A
Connecticut Light & Power Co. v. Wolf (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 903 137A
Francis v. Board of Pardons & Paroles (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 906 140A
Kudia v. Malik (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 905 139A
Leon v. Commissioner of Correction, 189 CA 512. 38A
Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel's concession of petitioner's guilt during closing argument to jury violated petitioner's sixth amendment right to client autonomy; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner was not deprived of right to effective assistance of counsel; whether habeas court properly determined that test set forth in Strickland v. Washington (466 U.S. 668) to determine whether petitioner received ineffective assistance of counsel was applicable and not exception under United States v. Cronin (466 U.S. 648) that relieves habeas petitioner of having to demonstrate prejudice when counsel entirely fails to function as advocate and does not subject state's case to meaningful adversarial testing; claim that habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner was not prejudiced by trial counsel's statements to jury; claim that reasonable probability existed that result of trial would have been different had counsel not made challenged comments to jury.

Liberty Transportation, Inc. v. Massachusetts Bay Ins. Co., 189 CA 595 121A
Contracts; whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly determined that plaintiff lacked standing to bring claims for lost rental income and for damages because plaintiff had sold property to third party and assigned rights to insurance proceeds to third party pursuant to terms of real estate purchase agreement; claim that plaintiff retained interest in damaged rental units as result of decision to exercise leaseback provision in real estate purchase agreement; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.

Malpeso v. Malpeso, 189 CA 486 12A
Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court erroneously determined that defendant's payment of children's college expenses constituted substantial change in circumstances warranting modification of alimony where parties' separation agreement required defendant to pay college expenses and contained no express provision permitting modification of alimony on basis of defendant's payment of those expenses; claim that trial court failed to consider entirety of parties'

(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.

financial circumstances in granting motions to modify; whether trial court erroneously found that defendant continued to suffer from cellulitis at time of proceedings on remand; whether trial court improperly engaged in speculation by considering defendant's risk of developing future medical conditions; claim that trial court erred in prohibiting plaintiff from offering testimony that was relevant to court's determination regarding whether to modify defendant's alimony obligations retroactively; claim that trial court, by sustaining objection of defendant's counsel to question directed to plaintiff concerning effect of defendant's contemptuous conduct, improperly denied plaintiff opportunity to testify about consequences of defendant's contemptuous conduct; claim that trial court erred in modifying defendant's alimony obligations retroactively because defendant had unclean hands.

Praisner v. State, 189 CA 540	66A
<i>Indemnification; subject matter jurisdiction; sovereign immunity; action pursuant to statute ([Rev. to 2013] § 53-39a) for indemnification from defendant state for economic losses that plaintiff allegedly incurred as result of federal criminal action filed against him in his capacity as member of certain special police force for state university; whether trial court improperly concluded that action was not barred by doctrine of sovereign immunity; whether trial court incorrectly determined that plaintiff, as member of state university's special police force, was authorized to bring action pursuant to § 53-39a, which expressly authorizes members of certain classes of individuals, including members of local police departments, to bring action against state under § 53-39a; whether plaintiff established reasonable basis on which to conclude that his claim for indemnification fell within narrow scope of waiver of sovereign immunity contained in § 53-39a.</i>	
Seale v. GeoQuest, Inc., 189 CA 587	113A
<i>Negligence; whether trial court's finding that defendant did not breach duty of care to plaintiff was clearly erroneous; credibility of witnesses.</i>	
Wilmington Trust Co. v. Bachelder (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 904	138A
Winthrop v. Winthrop, 189 CA 576	102A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion for contempt; whether trial court properly found that defendant's earned income in 2016 was amount reflected on his W-2 form and, thus, that he owed additional alimony pursuant to parties' separation agreement; claim that defendant, as financial advisor who did not receive salary or hourly wage from his employer but was compensated purely on commission basis, was for all practical purposes self-employed and, thus, his earned income should be his gross compensation minus his business related expenses, and not figure shown on his W-2 form; claim that inclusion of defendant's noncash earnings in his earned income was improper; whether trial court incorrectly calculated defendant's additional alimony payments.</i>	
Volume 189 Cumulative Table of Cases	141A

CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK

Notice of Public Hearing on Proposed Practice Book Revisions	1PB
------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

CT State Board of Examiners for Physical Therapists—Notice of Declaratory Ruling Proceeding	2B
Dept. of Social Services—Notice of Intent to Renew the Personal Care Assistant Medicaid Waiver	2B
Dept. of Social Services—Notice of Proposed Medicaid State Plan Amendment	1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Suspension of Attorney	1C
Office of State Ethics—Advisory Opinion No. 2019-1.	3C