

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 46

May 14, 2019

219 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Annuli v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 331 C 923 . . . . .	47
Brennan v. Waterbury, 331 C 672 . . . . .	16
<i>Workers' compensation; claim by city fire chief for statutory (§ 7-433c) heart and hypertension benefits; whether appeal should be dismissed on jurisdictional grounds because party identified on appeal form lacked standing to appeal from board's decision; whether claimant's estate could be proper recipient of heart and hypertension benefits if such benefits matured prior to claimant's death; whether record established that claimant's unpaid heart and hypertension benefits matured prior to his death.</i>	
Caron v. Connecticut Pathology Group, P.C. (Order), 331 C 922 . . . . .	46
Maurice v. Chester Housing Associates Ltd. Partnership (Order), 331 C 923 . . . . .	47
Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Speer (Order), 331 C 923 . . . . .	47
State v. Anderson (Order), 331 C 422. . . . .	46
State v. Owen, 331 C 658. . . . .	2
<i>Nolle prosequi; strangulation second degree; assault second degree; unlawful restraint second degree; threatening second degree; interfering with emergency call; motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly determined that prosecutor was not exercising her discretion in manner clearly contrary to manifest public interest in seeking to enter nolle prosequi as to all charges; prosecutor's basis for claim that material witness had become disabled within meaning of statute (§ 54-56b) governing entry of nolle prosequi, discussed; whether trial court properly relied on prosecutor's representations to find that she was not abusing her discretion; whether court properly allowed prosecutor to enter nolle.</i>	
Volume 331 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	49

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Anderson v. Malloy (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 909. . . . .	79A
Aronow v. Freedom of Information Commission, 189 CA 842. . . . .	54A
<i>Administrative appeal; request for documents pursuant to Freedom of Information Act (§ 1-200 et seq.); claim that trial court erred in granting defendant Freedom of Information Commission's motion to dismiss claim that plaintiff was aggrieved by commission's decision not to impose civil penalty against plaintiff's former employer; whether there was evidence in record to support contention that case was distinguishable from Burton v. Freedom of Information Commission (161 Conn. App. 654); whether plaintiff's argument that Burton was distinguishable had any evidentiary foundation; claim that trial court improperly dismissed plaintiff's claim that 2014 complaint was improperly dismissed on ground that plaintiff was not aggrieved because issues raised in 2014 complaint were addressed in 2015 complaint; whether record indicated that commission took relevant facts of 2014 complaint into consideration when making its decision that plaintiff's former employer had violated act; whether plaintiff demonstrated aggravement; claim that trial court erred in concluding that there was substantial evidence in record to support commission's finding that plaintiff had narrowed scope of request under act.</i>	
Buxenbaum v. Jones, 189 CA 790 . . . . .	2A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court failed to consider best interests of minor children in deciding custody; claim that trial court predetermined issue</i>	

(continued on next page)

*before close of evidence; whether trial court's input of data into worksheet before close of evidence evinced premature determination of issues; claim that trial court abused its discretion in failing to consider and rely on defendant's earning capacity when it issued its financial orders; whether plaintiff's claim that defendant should have been ordered to pay alimony and child support based on earning capacity was consistent with position taken at trial; whether trial court is required to base its financial orders on parties' earning capacities; claim that trial court lacked evidentiary support for its findings on court prepared worksheet as to defendant's net weekly income; whether permitting plaintiff to challenge trial court's financial orders after plaintiff asked court to rely on calculation of that income and court entered orders plaintiff requested amounted to sanctioning trial by ambush.*

Carl P. v. Dept. of Children & Families (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 908 . . . . . 78A  
 Commissioner of Transportation v. Lagosz, 189 CA 828 . . . . . 40A  
*Eminent domain; appeal to trial court from assessment of damages by Commissioner of Transportation for taking by condemnation of defendant's real property; claim that trial court, following hearing pursuant to Audubon Parking Associates Ltd. Partnership v. Barclay & Stubbs, Inc. (225 Conn. 804), improperly enforced purported settlement agreement because agreement was not inclusive of essential terms of agreement; whether relocation expenses for business of defendant's husband concerned essential term of settlement agreement; claim that trial court's finding that enforceable settlement agreement was entered into was clearly erroneous.*

Milford v. Hicks (Memorandum Decision), 189 CA 908 . . . . . 78A  
 Nahlawi v. Nahlawi, 189 CA 825. . . . . 37A  
*Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court improperly entered final child custody and visitation order in dissolution judgment that referenced pendente lite parenting plan that had been superseded by subsequent pendente lite parenting plan that parties and different trial court had intended would become final order of court; reviewability of claims that trial court improperly awarded periodic alimony and ordered transfer of certain real property; failure to brief claims adequately.*

Wachovia Mortgage, FSB v. Toczek, 189 CA 812 . . . . . 24A  
*Foreclosure; motions to dismiss appeal; automatic appellate stay; motion to terminate appellate stay; motion to reset law days; motion for review; motion for reconsideration; whether trial court's order resetting law days should be summarily reversed as being in contravention of appellate stay; RAL Management, Inc. v. Valley View Associates (278 Conn. 672) discussed; whether trial court violated appellate stay when it reset law days during period when defendant's motion for reconsideration of this court's denial of relief requested in motion for review was still pending.*

Volume 189 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 81A  
 Day v. Perkins Properties, LLC, 190 CA 33. . . . . 125A  
*Nuisance per se; whether trial court properly concluded as matter of law that defendants' operation of landscaping business in residential zone in violation of local zoning regulations constituted nuisance per se; whether violation of local ordinance was sufficient in itself to constitute nuisance per se.*

(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.

In re Probate Appeal of Knott, 190 CA 56 . . . . . 148A  
*Probate appeal; whether trial court properly dismissed probate appeal as untimely on ground that substitute plaintiff did not appeal within time limits set by applicable statute (§ 45a-186 [a]); whether time limits for filing probate appeal were tolled by filing of application for waiver of fees pursuant to applicable statute (§ 45a-186c [b]).*

State v. Irizarry, 190 CA 40. . . . . 132A  
*Assault in second degree; breach of peace in second degree; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of assault in second degree in violation of statute (§ 53a-60 [a] [1]); claim that state did not establish that defendant caused victim serious physical injury as defined by statute (§ 53a-3 [4]); claim that improper statement by prosecutor during closing argument to jury deprived defendant of constitutional right to fair trial; harmfulness of improper statement by prosecutor during closing argument to jury.*

State v. Riley, 190 CA 1. . . . . 93A  
*Murder; whether resentencing court improperly denied motion for recusal where resentencing court was same court that presided over defendant's trial and imposed initial sentence; claim that recusal of resentencing court was required by statute (§ 51-183c), rule of practice (§ 1-22 [a]) Code of Judicial Conduct (rule 2.11 [a] [1]), and due process clauses of fifth and fourteenth amendments to United States constitution; claim that Practice Book § 1-22 provided ground for recusal independent of that provided by § 51-183c; claim that rule 2.11 (a) (1) of Code of Judicial Conduct required recusal on ground that resentencing court was biased in favor of justifying defendant's initial sentence; claim that defendant's initial sentence had anchoring effect that prevented resentencing court from approaching resentencing hearing with fully open mind that would allow it to fully consider requirement under Miller v. Alabama (567 U.S. 460) that it give mitigating weight to defendant's youth and its hallmark features when considering whether to impose functional equivalent of life imprisonment without parole; claim that resentencing court considered seventy year sentence to be inappropriate but nevertheless imposed it because defendant would be eligible for parole pursuant to legislative amendments (P.A. 15-84) to statutes applicable to sentencing of children convicted of certain felonies (§ 54-91g) and parole eligibility (§ 54-125a); claim that resentencing court was required under Supreme Court's reversal of defendant's initial sentence and remand order to find that defendant was incorrigible, irreparably corrupt or irretrievably depraved before resentencing him to life without possibility of parole; whether discussion by Supreme Court in decision reversing defendant's initial sentence about presumption against life sentence without parole that must be overcome by evidence of unusual circumstances was rendered inapplicable by enactment of P.A. 15-84; claim that Miller, Supreme Court's decision reversing defendant's sentence and P.A. 15-84 limited resentencing court's discretion by creating presumption against imposition of life sentence that could be imposed only after finding that juvenile was permanently incorrigible, irreparably corrupt or irretrievably depraved.*

Volume 190 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 155A

**NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES**

City of Milford—Notice of Completion of Certificate of Affordable Housing . . . . . 1B

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Division of Criminal Justice—Notice of Job Opportunity . . . . . 1C  
 Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel . . . . . 3C  
 Notice of Substitute Appointment of Trustee . . . . . 3C