

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

---

VOL. LXXX No. 52                      June 25, 2019                      300 Pages

---

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Benjamin v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 332 C 906 . . . . .	54
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Speer (Order), 332 C 907. . . . .	55
Fiano v. Old Saybrook Fire Co. No. 1, Inc., 332 C 93. . . . .	29
<i>Negligence; summary judgment; vicarious liability; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly upheld trial court's granting of summary judgment in favor of defendant fire company and defendant town on ground that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether individual defendant was acting within scope of his employment with fire company at time of motor vehicle accident giving rise to plaintiff's action; claim that individual defendant, by being in close proximity to fire company's premises, provided benefit to fire company; interplay between workers' compensation law and doctrine of respondeat superior, discussed.</i>	
Fields v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 332 C 904 . . . . .	52
Girolametti v. Michael Horton Associates, Inc., 332 C 67 . . . . .	3
<i>Construction; arbitration; res judicata; privity; summary judgment; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly reversed trial court's denial of defendant subcontractors' motions for summary judgment on ground that defendant subcontractors were in privity with defendant general contractor for purposes of res judicata; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that plaintiffs' claims were barred by res judicata because they could have been raised during prior arbitration between plaintiffs and general contractor; whether Appellate Court properly adopted rebuttable presumption that subcontractors are in privity with general contractor on construction project for purposes of res judicata; claim that application of presumption of privity would be unfair; claim that Appellate Court improperly concluded, on basis of parties' contractual relationships, that defendant subcontractors were in privity with general contractor; claim that presumption of privity was ill suited for complexities of commercial construction industry; whether presumption of privity should apply under facts of present case; claim that Appellate Court's conclusion that general contractor was in privity with defendant subcontractors was inconsistent with arbitrator's factual finding that contract did not obligate general contractor to perform or to be responsible for all design and engineering aspects of construction project.</i>	
Girolametti v. VP Buildings, Inc. (See Girolametti v. Michael Horton Associates, Inc.), 332 C 67. . . . .	3
Harvey v. Department of Correction (Order), 332 C 905 . . . . .	53
In re Probate Appeal of Fumega-Serrano (Order), 332 C 906 . . . . .	54
Praisner v. State (Order), 332 C 905 . . . . .	53
State v. Bethea (Order), 332 C 904 . . . . .	52
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Robles (Order), 332 C 906 . . . . .	54
Volume 332 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	57

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Almeida v. Almeida, 190 CA 760. . . . .	70A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court improperly modified dissolution judgment when it granted motion for clarification of dissolution judgment.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Brocuglio v. Thompsonville Fire District #2, 190 CA 718 . . . . . 28A  
*Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner that employee's claim for benefits under Heart and Hypertension Act (§ 7-433c) was compensable; claim that commissioner lacked jurisdiction to consider plaintiff's claim because plaintiff failed to file notice of claim required by statute (§ 31-294c [a]) within one year of when he previously had been informed by cardiologist that he suffered from pericarditis; whether plaintiff's failure to file timely notice of claim as to pericarditis barred subsequent claim for mitral valve replacement and coronary artery disease, where commissioner determined that mitral valve replacement and coronary artery disease were new injuries separate and distinct from pericarditis.*

DeChellis v. DeChellis, 190 CA 853 . . . . . 163A  
*Dissolution of marriage; arbitration; reviewability of unreserved claim that trial court improperly confirmed award of attorney's fees incurred by plaintiff's counsel in complying with order of arbitrator because award did not conform to arbitration submission approved by court; claim that court committed plain error in denying motion to vacate arbitration award on grounds that award of attorney's fees did not conform to arbitration submission approved by court and violated public policy; reviewability of unreserved claim that court improperly confirmed award of attorney's fees associated with certain motions to reargue underlying judgment because award was contrary dissolution judgment; request for this court to exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to reverse trial court's approval of agreement to arbitrate and to provide guidance to trial courts regarding proper application of statute (§ 46b-66 [c]) governing procedure to be followed when parties in dissolution proceeding agree to binding arbitration.*

Farmington-Girard, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission, 190 CA 743 . . . . . 53A  
*Zoning; administrative appeals; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly dismissed appeals for failure to exhaust administrative remedies; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff was required to appeal to city's zoning board of appeals from decision of city's director of planning division voiding its special permit application; whether trial court properly concluded that city's zoning regulations provided director with authority to declare special permit application void; whether zoning regulations supported plaintiff's claim that only defendant city planning and zoning commission had authority to declare application void; claim that there was no statutory or regulatory avenue for appeal of decision voiding application; claim that appeal to board would have been futile.*

Pamela Corp. v. Planning & Zoning Commission (See Farmington-Girard, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission), 190 CA 743. . . . . 53A

Roger B. v. Commissioner of Correction, 190 CA 817 . . . . . 127A  
*Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly denied petition for writ of habeas corpus; whether petitioner demonstrated that he was prejudiced or harmed by his trial counsel's failure to assert statute of limitations affirmative defense to charges with respect to eighteen month delay between issuance of arrest warrant and execution of arrest warrant; claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that*

(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.

*five year statute of limitations (§ 54-193), and not State v. Crawford (202 Conn. 443), was controlling law on statute of limitations affirmative defense; claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that § 54-193 (d) tolled limitation period; claim that habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner had been elusive, unavailable and unapproachable by police once arrest warrant had been issued; whether habeas court properly found that petitioner failed to demonstrate that state could not prove that time in which arrest warrant was served was reasonable; whether habeas court properly found that trial counsel’s representation of petitioner did not fall below objective standard of reasonableness; whether petitioner proved that he was prejudiced by counsel’s performance.*

State v. Pugh, 190 CA 794 . . . . . 104A  
*Robbery in first degree; assault in first degree; carrying pistol or revolver without permit; whether evidence of defendant’s identity was sufficient to support conviction; claim that trial court violated defendant’s right to due process when it denied motion to dismiss charge; claim that defendant was substantially prejudiced by twenty-three month delay between time crimes were committed and date of his arrest; claim that in absence of delay in defendant’s arrest, he would have been able to obtain certain employment records that would have shown he was at work when crimes took place; claim that delay in defendant’s arrest resulted in faded memories of witnesses; whether defendant showed that, in absence of delay in his arrest, information pertaining to his cell phone number would have been available at trial to show that he was not in vicinity of robbery and shooting at time it occurred; whether trial court committed plain error by giving jury consciousness of guilt instruction regarding letter defendant wrote to girlfriend; claim that consciousness of guilt instruction improperly bolstered insufficient case; whether letter was highly probative of and supported reasonable inference as to whether defendant tampered with witness.*

State v. Turner, 190 CA 693 . . . . . 3A  
*Felony murder; robbery in first degree; attempt to possess narcotics; claim that defendant’s due process rights were violated because trial court improperly allowed jury to base guilty verdict on legally invalid but factually supported theory that completed larceny by false pretenses, which was accomplished by bail scheme, that preceded use of force, and was part of continuous course of larcenous conduct, could be predicate felony for robbery and felony murder; claim that larceny by false pretenses could not be predicate felony for robbery or felony murder because no force was used to obtain property; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support conviction of attempt to possess narcotics; claim that there was insufficient evidence that defendant actively attempted to possess narcotics.*

U.S. Bank, National Assn. v. Fitzpatrick, 190 CA 773. . . . . 83A  
*Foreclosure; standing; special defenses; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss action; whether trial court correctly determined that plaintiff had standing to bring action; whether plaintiff demonstrated that it was valid holder of note and owner of the debt with standing to pursue action; whether defendant failed to satisfy his burden of proving that another party was owner of subject note and debt; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to liability; claim that genuine issues of material fact existed as to plaintiff’s standing; whether defendant failed to meet his burden of demonstrating that genuine issues of material fact existed as to his equitable defenses of laches and unclean hands.*

Volume 190 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 183A  
 Maria W. v. Eric W., 191 CA 27 . . . . . 221A  
*Dissolution of marriage; motion for contempt; claim that trial court abused its discretion by admitting plaintiff’s testimony that defendant previously had been arrested and charged with certain criminal offenses; claim that trial court improperly found defendant in arrears on child support and alimony obligations and ordered him to make certain weekly payments; whether order appealed from was final where trial court resolved some, but not all, claims in motion for contempt and continued matter to later date for determination of whether defendant’s failure to pay arrears was wilful or due to inability to pay; whether this court lacked jurisdiction to entertain claim on appeal due to lack of final judgment.*

1916 Post Road Associates, LLC v. Mrs. Green’s of Fairfield, Inc., 191 CA 16 . . . . . 210A  
*Landlord-tenant; guarantee of commercial lease; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment; whether guarantor’s letters to plaintiff created genuine issue of material fact as to whether guarantor was liable to plaintiff lessor for debts of lessee.*

Smith v. Marshview Fitness, LLC, 191 CA 1 . . . . . 195A  
*Fraudulent transfer; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly concluded that transfer of certain property to defendant company was not*

*fraudulent under common law or Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act (§ 52-552a et seq.) on ground that property did not constitute "assets" because it was encumbered by valid lien in excess of its value; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment on claim alleging violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.) because underlying conduct on which plaintiff claimed defendant company violated CUTPA was broader than facts supporting his fraudulent transfer claims; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to reargue motion for summary judgment.*

Volume 191 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 229A

**NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES**

Dept. of Social Services—Notices of Proposed Medicaid State Plan Amendment . . . . . 1B  
 Dept. of Housing—Notice of Application for a Moratorium . . . . . 3B

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Notice of Suspension . . . . . 1C  
 Division of Criminal Justice—Notice of Job Opportunity . . . . . 3C

---