

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 9

August 27, 2019

272 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Lederle v. Spivey, 332 C 837	51
<i>Attorney's fees; dissolution of marriage; appeal from denial of motion to open judgment; award of appellate attorney's fees pursuant to bad faith exception to American rule generally prohibiting award of such fees to prevailing party; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had abused its discretion in awarding attorney's fees under bad faith exception because its decision lacked high degree of specificity as to its finding that defendant's appeal from denial of motion to open was entirely without color; requirements of bad faith and colorability for bad faith exception, discussed; whether amount of attorney's fees was unreasonable and excessive.</i>	
State v. Tony M., 332 C 810	24
<i>Murder; risk of injury to child; whether trial court properly denied defendant's motion to suppress evidence arising from statements that he had made to police during interview at hospital; claim that defendant did not voluntarily waive his rights under Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436); claim that statements made during partially unrecorded hospital interview were inadmissible pursuant to statute (§ 54-1o); whether any error in admission of defendant's statements was harmless; claim that trial court had abused its discretion in excluding letter from defense counsel containing pretrial plea offer from defendant.</i>	
Traylor v. State, 332 C 789	3
<i>Action seeking declaration that statute (§ 52-190a) requiring complaint sounding in medical malpractice to be accompanied by good faith certificate and opinion letter authored by similar health care provider is unconstitutional; claim that § 52-190a violated plaintiff's rights to due process, equal protection, and access to courts because it imposed financial burden and other obstacles on plaintiffs seeking to bring medical malpractice claims; summary judgment; motion to dismiss; reviewability of plaintiff's claim that § 52-190a is unconstitutional; whether plaintiff's claim that § 52-190a is unconstitutional was effectively moot because plaintiff failed to challenge in his appellate brief trial court's conclusions that claims against defendants were barred by res judicata, collateral estoppel, and prior pending action doctrine.</i>	
Volume 332 Cumulative Table of Cases	73

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Kusy v. Norwich, 192 CA 171	105A
<i>Negligence; summary judgment; governmental immunity; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of defendants on ground of governmental immunity pursuant to statute (§ 52-557n [a] [2] [B]); claim that snow and ice removal by municipality is ministerial act as matter of law; whether in absence of policy or directive prescribing manner in which municipal official is to remove snow and ice such act is discretionary in nature; whether trial court properly determined that removal of snow and ice at subject school was discretionary in nature; whether issue of whether removal of snow and ice is ministerial in nature is factual question that is reserved for jury and may not be decided by trial court by way of summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly determined that plaintiff failed to raise genuine issue of material fact regarding whether he was identifiable victim for purposes of identifiable person-imminent harm exception to governmental immunity.</i>	

(continued on next page)

- Sen v. Tsiongas, 192 CA 188 122A
Negligence; premises liability; action to recover damages for personal injuries sustained by plaintiff tenant when she was bitten by dog owned by another tenant of defendant landlord; whether trial court erred in rendering summary judgment in favor of defendant; whether there was disputed issue of material fact as to whether defendant landlord should have known that tenant's dog had vicious propensities.
- State v. Battle, 192 CA 128 62A
Violation of probation; whether trial court improperly dismissed motion to correct illegal sentence; whether defendant challenged sentence imposed rather than events leading to conviction; whether trial court had jurisdiction to consider merits of motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that imposition of special parole, following determination that defendant had violated probation, constituted illegal sentence; whether defendant's sentence, including use of special parole, fell within "any lesser sentence" language of applicable statute (§ 53a-32 [d]); claim that defendant was denied due process of law when motion to correct illegal sentence was not acted on by specific judge who had sentenced defendant; whether motion to correct illegal sentence or sentence imposed in illegal manner must be heard and adjudicated by particular judge who imposed sentence; whether defendant's unreserved claim that defendant was deprived of full and fair proceeding with regard to motion to correct illegal sentence failed under third prong of State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233).
- State v. Brown, 192 CA 147 81A
Assault in second degree; threatening in first degree; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that statutes governing concurrent and consecutive sentences (§ 53a-37) and addressing method of calculation of sentences (§ 53a-38) were ambiguous and contradictory; claim that § 53a-38 is unconstitutional because it violates defendant's constitutional rights to due process, to be free from double jeopardy, and to equal protection; whether court had jurisdiction over claim in motion to correct illegal sentence that did not attack sentencing proceeding itself; claim that prisoners sentenced to consecutive sentences are members of suspect class; whether claim that aggregation of consecutive sentences adversely affected defendant's eligibility for parole and risk reduction credits fell within ambit of double jeopardy.
- State v. Fox, 192 CA 221 155A
Home invasion; conspiracy to commit home invasion; assault in first degree; conspiracy to commit assault in first degree; claim that trial court violated defendant's right against double jeopardy by sentencing defendant on two counts of conspiracy pursuant to single agreement with multiple criminal objectives; whether appropriate remedy was to reverse judgment of lesser offense of conspiracy and remand case to trial court with direction to vacate conviction; claim that defendant's right to due process under Connecticut constitution was violated by state's failure to produce discernible photographs of crime scene; whether defendant met balancing test set forth in State v. Asherman (193 Conn. 695); whether defendant established

(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.

materiality of indiscernible photographs; whether likelihood of mistaken interpretation of missing evidence by witnesses or jury was low; whether state's failure to preserve useful photographic evidence of condition of doors at crime scene was result of any bad faith or improper motive on part of state or law enforcement; whether defendant was prejudiced as result of unavailable evidence; whether trial court erred when it denied defendant's request for adverse inference jury instruction related to failure of police to produce discernable photographs; whether factual basis existed for specific charge requested by defendant; whether defendant showed that it was more probable than not that failure to give requested instruction affected result of trial.

State v. Moon, 192 CA 68. 2A

Felony murder; robbery in first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; jury instructions; claim that trial court erred when it provided jury with supplemental instruction in response to jury question regarding use of force element of robbery in first degree; claim that court introduced new theory of liability when it added phrase "another participant" to instructions on use of physical force element of robbery in first degree; claim that supplemental instruction invaded province of jury or suggested preferred verdict; claim that court erred when it declined to poll jurors on affirmative defense to felony murder charge; claim that trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence two spent shell casings that were found in defendant's house two days after shooting; claim that shell casings were impermissible evidence of defendant's criminal propensity; whether defendant waived claim that trial court improperly instructed the jury on conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree when it omitted intent element required for underlying crime of robbery in first degree by failing to instruct jury that it had to find that defendant intended to commit robbery while he or another participant was armed; claim that court's instruction constituted plain error.

State v. Rodriguez, 192 CA 115 49A

Public indecency; breach of peace; improper use of marker, registration, or license; illegal operation of motor vehicle while driver's license was under suspension; failure to appear in second degree; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly admitted evidence of uncharged misconduct; whether trial court committed plain error by admitting uncharged misconduct evidence; claim that defendant was entitled to plain error reversal because trial court improperly instructed jury on uncharged misconduct evidence; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to sever failure to appear counts from other counts in information.

State v. Tarasiuk, 192 CA 207 141A

Assault of public safety personnel; criminal trespass; whether trial court abused its discretion by permitting state to introduce evidence of prior felony conviction of defendant for criminal violation of restraining order for purpose of impeaching defendant's credibility; whether defendant failed to demonstrate that admission of evidence of prior felony constituted harmful error entitling him to new trial; whether state was required to prove that defendant intended to physically harm police officer; whether defendant's admissions supported jury finding that defendant intended to prevent police officer from performing duties; whether jury reasonably could have found any ameliorative aspects of defendant's testimony to be not credible; whether admission of prior felony conviction substantially affected verdict.

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Fratarcangeli, 192 CA 159. 93A

Foreclosure; special defenses; motion to strike; attestation of mortgage deed; notary public; claim that mortgage deed was invalid because there was no second attesting witness as required by statute (§ 47-5 [a]); whether trial court improperly concluded that validating statute (§ 47-36aa) rendered mortgage deed valid and enforceable; whether witnessing defect was automatically cured by § 47-36aa; whether trial court properly granted substitute plaintiff's motion to strike special defense of illegal attestation of mortgage deed as legally insufficient; whether § 47-36aa (a) (2) contains fraud exception for instances where it is alleged that lack of valid second attesting witness resulted from fraudulent act; whether trial court properly granted substitute plaintiff's motion to strike special defense of unclean hands as to attestation of mortgage deed; whether defendant alleged that conduct claimed to be unclean was done directly against defendant's interests; whether unclean hands doctrine was available to defendant on basis of allegations made in support of defendant's second special defense.

Wilson v. Di Iulio AP192.401, 192 CA 101 35A

Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly failed to award more than nominal alimony; claim that trial court abused its discretion by making property award enforceable by modifiable alimony award.

State v. Mercer (replacement pages), 191 CA 291-92. v
Volume 192 Cumulative Table of Cases 181A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

State of Connecticut Board of Examiners for Physical Therapy 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Division of Criminal Justice—Personnel Notice. 2C
Notices of Reprimand of Attorneys 1C
Notice of Suspension of Attorney Misconduct and Appointment of Trustee 1C
