


CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 49

June 4, 2019

226 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Ashmore v. Hartford Hospital, 331 C 777.	3
<i>Wrongful death; medical malpractice; loss of consortium; motion for remittitur of loss of consortium award; claim that this court should adopt plenary standard of appellate review of trial court's decision to grant or deny motion for remittitur and overrule prior case law establishing that such decisions are reviewed according to deferential abuse of discretion standard; whether loss of consortium award in wrongful death action presumptively should not be substantially greater than noneconomic damages portion of wrongful death award; whether jury reasonably could have found, on basis of evidence presented, that circumstances justified loss of consortium award that was substantially greater than wrongful death award; whether plaintiff's decision to terminate husband's life support constituted sort of harm that fell within ambit of loss of consortium; remand for reconsideration of defendant's motion for remittitur.</i>	
Lively v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 331 C 929	45
Margarita O. v. Fernando I. (Order), 331 C 930	46
Money Source, Inc. v. Kilbride (Order), 331 C 930	46
RoundPoint Mortgage Servicing Corp. v. Richloff (Order), 331 C 930	46
Stanley v. Scott (Order), 331 C 929	45
Volume 331 Cumulative Table of Cases	47

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of America, N.A. v. Defelice (Memorandum Decision), 190 CA 902	160A
Barry A. v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 190 CA 903	161A
Flagstar Bank, FSB v. Kepple, 190 CA 312.	18A
<i>Foreclosure; claim that plaintiff lacked standing to commence foreclosure action; whether defendants failed to rebut presumption that plaintiff, as holder of note, was rightful owner of underlying debt and, therefore, had standing to commence foreclosure action; whether statement by trial court at hearing constituted finding of fact.</i>	
Hilario Truck Center, LLC v. Kohn, 190 CA 443.	149A
<i>Contracts; third-party beneficiary; whether plaintiff towing company that provided towing services to defendant insured motorist had standing as third-party beneficiary to bring direct breach of contract action against defendant insurance company that provided automobile liability coverage to motorist; whether plaintiff met its burden of demonstrating that trial court committed error by granting motion to dismiss.</i>	
In re Elizabeth B. (Memorandum Decision), 190 CA 902.	160A
O'Brien-Kelley, Ltd. v. Goshen, 190 CA 420	126A
<i>Tax warrant; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant state marshal was entitled to statutory fee of 15 percent of tax, interest, fees and costs for service of alias tax warrant pursuant to statute (§ 12-162 [c]) to collect delinquent real estate tax and interest; claim that defendant was not entitled to 15 percent fee under § 12-162 because he did not execute on tax warrant or collect delinquent taxes, but merely mailed notice of tax warrant to plaintiff, which thereafter paid delinquent tax and interest to town directly before warrant was served.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Roger R. v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 190 CA 902	160A
St. Denis-Lima v. St. Denis, 190 CA 296	2A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court abused its discretion in ruling on motion to dismiss dissolution action without first holding evidentiary hearing; claim that certified and officially translated Brazilian document that plaintiff submitted to trial court established disputed jurisdictional fact that required evidentiary hearing on motion to dismiss; whether trial court's determination that there was final judgment of dissolution in Brazil was clearly erroneous; whether trial court abused its discretion in affording comity to dissolution judgment rendered by Brazilian court; claim that Brazilian judgment was contrary to public policy of Connecticut.</i>	
Santa Energy Corp. v. Santa (Memorandum Decision), 190 CA 901	159A
State v. Dojnia, 190 CA 353	59A
<i>Assault of disabled person in second degree; unreserved claim that statute (§ 53a-60b [a] [1]) prohibiting assault of disabled person in second degree is unconstitutionally vague as applied to defendant's violent conduct toward victim; whether statute (§ 1-1f [b]) that defines physical disability is ambiguous as to whether fibromyalgia constitutes physical disability; claim that state bore burden of proving beyond reasonable doubt that victim's physical disability was caused by any particular illness or injury and that diagnosis was medically accurate; whether evidence was sufficient to prove that victim had diagnosis of fibromyalgia; whether diagnosis of fibromyalgia satisfied physical disability requirement of § 53a-60b (a) (1); whether evidence was sufficient to prove that victim suffered from physical disability for purposes of § 53a-60b (a) (1); whether defendant was deprived of right to fair trial as result of prosecutor's comment during closing argument.</i>	
State v. Marcus H., 190 CA 332	38A
<i>Assault in second degree with motor vehicle; risk of injury to child; reckless endangerment in first degree; reckless driving; operating motor vehicle while under influence of intoxicating liquor; interfering with officer; increasing speed in attempt to escape or elude police officer; application for public defender; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to counsel and, therefore, to due process, by denying application for appointment of public defender; whether trial court's implicit finding that defendant was not indigent was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to due process by failing to order, sua sponte, judicial marshal to remove defendant's shackles during trial; whether defendant demonstrated existence of constitutional violation that deprived him of fair trial; whether defendant's failure to object to being tried before jury in shackles was sufficient to negate compulsion necessary to establish constitutional violation; whether defendant was compelled to stand trial before jury while visibly shackled.</i>	
Turchiano v. Roadmaster Paving & Sealing, LLC (Memorandum Decision), 190 CA 902	160A
Vitti v. Milford, 190 CA 398.	104A
<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board erred as matter of law by applying version of applicable statute ([Rev. to 2009] § 7-433c) that was in</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.

effect on date of plaintiff's injury to plaintiff's claim for heart and hypertension benefits; claim that board should have applied version of § 7-433c that was in effect on date of plaintiff's hire in 1993; claim that board erred as matter of law by affirming finding of Workers' Compensation Commissioner that plaintiff's giant cell myocarditis constituted heart disease under § 7-433c; credibility of witnesses.

Zaniewski v. Zaniewski, 190 CA 386 92A

Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly failed to use parties' net incomes in calculating its orders of child support and alimony; claim that trial court improperly ordered defendant to pay alimony in amount that exceeded ability to pay; claim that trial court abused its discretion by crafting inequitable property distribution and alimony orders; whether it was possible to ascertain what path trial court followed in crafting its support orders and dividing marital assets without engaging in pure speculation; whether defendant did all that could reasonably be expected to obtain articulation; whether unique circumstances of case warranted new trial on financial matters; whether presumption of correctness of trial court's orders applied where there was inadequate factual record and appellant did all that could reasonably be expected of him to obtain articulation of factual findings necessary to obtain review of financial orders but was thwarted, through no fault of his own, due to retirement of trial judge.

Volume 190 Cumulative Table of Cases 163A

CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK

Notice of Public Hearing on Practice Book Revisions to the Rules of Appellate Procedure 1PB