

188 Conn. App. 304

MARCH, 2019

337

State *v.* Gonzalez

chance to rebut the state's view of the evidence, and that his theory of defense was to challenge the persuasiveness and reliability of the DNA evidence. He asserted that he was denied the right to final argument especially with respect to the prosecutor's rebuttal argument that he was the only person in Connecticut who could be a contributor to the DNA mixture and that defense counsel was not given an opportunity to correct the argument. The defendant claims that this was extraordinarily harmful because juries, lawyers, and judges have a difficult time interpreting probabilistic information. This claim was not raised at trial and, therefore, is not preserved. Moreover, the defendant claims that he did not have the chance to counter the prosecutor's argument in the context of his own theory that there were serious questions about the collection, preservation, and testing of the physical evidence that called Renstrom's testimony into question.

The defendant's contention that he is entitled to a new trial on the basis of the prosecutor's rebuttal argument is flawed for at least two reasons. If, as he argues on appeal, the prosecutor's argument that he was the only person in Connecticut who could have contributed to the DNA mixture is wrong, defense counsel could have objected to the argument at trial, but did not. Counsel, therefore, must not have thought that it misled the jury. Given the complexity of DNA evidence, a contemporaneous objection not only preserves the claimed impropriety for review but also provides the court an opportunity to take corrective action, if necessary. The failure to make such an objection is a factor to be considered when considering the claim of prosecutorial impropriety. See *State v. Brett B.*, supra, 186 Conn. App. 572.

As to his second contention that defense counsel could not counter the prosecutor's DNA argument, we note that at the conclusion of the first portion of her summation, the prosecutor, in so many words, told the jury that DNA was the key to the case. During his final

NOTE: These pages (188 Conn. App. 337 and 338) are in replacement of the same numbered pages that appear in the Connecticut Law Journal of 12 March 2019.

338

MARCH, 2019

188 Conn. App. 304

State v. Gonzalez

argument, defense counsel made clear to the jury all of the problems in the collection, preservation, and testing of the DNA evidence. The defendant, therefore, was not deprived of his right to final argument and to present his view of the DNA evidence. In fact, defense counsel anticipated and attempted to refute the prosecutor's rebuttal.

For the foregoing reasons, the defendant's claim of prosecutorial impropriety during final argument fails.

III

The defendant's final claim is that he is entitled to a new trial on the charge of home invasion because the second portion of the prosecutor's final argument misled the jury on the elements of the crime of home invasion, and that the misstatement was not harmless beyond a reasonable doubt. We disagree.

The defendant's claim is predicated on his representation, in his appellate brief, of a portion of the prosecutor's closing argument, to wit: "During closing argument, after quoting the substitute information, the state's attorney told the jury that 'basically, [the information] means that the defendant had to unlawfully enter the dwelling while a person was inside *with the intent to commit a sexual assault . . .*'" (Emphasis in original.) He argues that the language misrepresented the law to the jury because it invited the jury to find him guilty even if it did not find beyond a reasonable doubt that he intended to commit a sexual assault by force at the time of entry. The defendant correctly states that prosecutors are not permitted to misstate the law because it invites a conviction unwarranted by the law and facts.²¹ See *State v. Otto*, supra, 305 Conn. 77. "A

²¹ The defendant also argues that all of the *Williams* factors except the frequency of the impropriety weigh in favor of reversal. See footnote 16 of this opinion; *State v. Williams*, 204 Conn. 523, 540, 529 A.2d 653 (1987). He contends that reversal is warranted because the state's case was relatively weak and the court gave no curative instruction. Because we conclude that the prosecutor committed no impropriety in her final argument, we need not address the *Williams* factors. Again, we note that trial counsel did not object to the portion of the prosecutor's argument at issue in this claim and requested no curative instruction.