

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 8

August 20, 2019

172 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Dept. of Transportation <i>v.</i> White Oak Corp., 332 C 776	2
<i>Arbitration; whether trial court properly denied postjudgment motion seeking determination as to whether judgment against plaintiff had been fully satisfied where defendant had obtained judgment against plaintiff awarding money damages, and comptroller, pursuant to statute (§ 12-39g), reduced amount of award by amount of taxes owed by defendant; claim that comptroller was collaterally estopped from withholding taxes owed to state and making such deduction in present case because plaintiff had failed to prove claim it had made relating to existence of same tax debt in separate arbitration proceeding; whether, pursuant to plain language of § 12-39g, comptroller had mandatory obligation to reduce payment by amount of taxes owed, unless they were subject of timely filed administrative appeal; failure of defendant to file administrative appeal challenging taxes.</i>	
Volume 332 Cumulative Table of Cases	15

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Kathrynne S. <i>v.</i> Swetz, 191 CA 850	2A
<i>Application for relief from abuse; domestic violence restraining order; whether there was sufficient evidence to support trial court's finding that defendant presented continuous threat of present physical harm or injury to plaintiff; claim that trial court was improperly influenced by defendant's invocation of right against self-incrimination pursuant to fifth amendment of United States constitution; whether trial court applied incorrect standard of proof in granting application for relief from abuse; whether preponderance of evidence standard was proper standard of proof to apply to case involving domestic violence restraining order.</i>	
Welsh <i>v.</i> Martinez, 191 CA 862.	14A
<i>Contempt; claim that trial court improperly found defendant in contempt because asset standstill order lacked sufficient clarity and was ambiguous; claim that trial court failed to consider defendant's ability to pay in imposing compensatory fine; claim that court abused its discretion in imposing compensatory fine without necessary factual basis; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff was harmed by defendant's contemptuous conduct; whether trial court furnished adequate factual basis to support compensatory fine.</i>	
Volume 191 Cumulative Table of Cases	39A
Nonhuman Rights Project, Inc. <i>v.</i> R.W. Commerford & Sons, Inc., 192 CA 36	86A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly declined to issue writ of habeas corpus pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-24 [a] [1] and [2]); whether habeas court properly concluded that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner lacked standing to bring habeas petition on behalf of elephants; whether elephants, not being persons, lacked standing to file habeas petition; whether petitioner failed to establish next friend standing; whether habeas corpus relief was intended to apply to nonhuman animal; whether, pursuant to statute (§ 52-466 [a]), only person is authorized to file application for writ of habeas corpus.</i>	
State <i>v.</i> Marsan, 192 CA 49.	99A
<i>Burglary in third degree; larceny in sixth degree; motion to suppress; whether there was sufficient evidence to support conviction of burglary in third degree; whether defendant was licensed and privileged to be in victim's home when she committed</i>	

(continued on next page)

*larceny; whether license was explicitly or implicitly revoked; whether state presented evidence from which jury reasonably could have concluded that defendant committed larceny in manner likely to terrorize victim or occupants in victim's home; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress statements that defendant made to police detectives in her home; whether defendant was in custody and entitled to warnings pursuant to *Miranda v. Arizona* (384 U.S. 436) when she was questioned by detectives; whether reasonable person in defendant's position would have felt that she was in custody for purposes of *Miranda*; whether fact that defendant was suspect at time of encounter with detectives transformed encounter into custodial interrogation.*

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Caldrello, 192 CA 1	51A
<i>Foreclosure; standing; claim that trial court erred in concluding that no genuine issue of material fact existed with respect to plaintiff's standing and in rendering summary judgment as to liability in plaintiff's favor; whether plaintiff met its evidentiary burden and raised presumption that it was holder of note and rightful owner of debt; whether plaintiff was successor by merger to original holder of subject note; whether, under federal banking law (12 U.S.C. § 215a [e]), all of rights in note of original holder automatically transferred to plaintiff without need for any endorsement; whether defendant's submissions in opposition to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment failed to satisfy her burden to rebut, with competent evidence, presumption that plaintiff, as holder of note, was also rightful owner of debt and had standing to bring foreclosure action; whether defendant's submissions in opposition to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment as to liability lacked adequate evidentiary foundation; whether defendant presented evidence that some entity other than plaintiff owned note at time action was commenced or at any time thereafter; reviewability of claims; failure to provide adequate record for review of claims or to brief claims adequately.</i>	
Volume 192 Cumulative Table of Cases	119A

CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK

Adopted Amendments to the Rules of Appellate Procedure	1PB
--	-----

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

City of Milford—Issuance of Certificate of Affordable Housing Project Completion	1B
--	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Division of Criminal Justice—Personnel Notice	1C
Notice of Suspension of Attorney	1C

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.