

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 10 September 3, 2019 221 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Sena v. American Medical Response of Connecticut, Inc., 333 C 30	32
<i>Negligence; whether trial court's denial of defendant city's motion for summary judgment claiming immunity pursuant to statute (§ 28-13) governing liability of political subdivisions for actions taken in response to civil preparedness emergencies constituted final judgment for purpose of appeal; nature of immunity provided to political subdivisions under § 28-13, discussed; whether trial court improperly denied city's motion for summary judgment; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether emergency continued to exist at time of alleged negligence.</i>	
Metcalf v. Fitzgerald, 333 C 1	3
<i>Vexatious litigation; Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); whether trial court properly dismissed state law claims alleging vexatious litigation and violation of CUTPA for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's state law claims; whether plaintiff's state law claims were expressly preempted by federal Bankruptcy Code; whether plaintiff's state law claims were implicitly preempted by federal Bankruptcy Code; claim that Congress did not intend to occupy field of sanctions and remedies for abuse of bankruptcy process; claim that plaintiff's state law claims were not preempted because remedies under Connecticut law and federal law are different.</i>	
Volume 333 Cumulative Table of Cases	63

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Saint Paul, 192 CA 245	3A
<i>Arbitration; whether trial court properly dismissed application to vacate arbitration award as untimely; whether trial court properly granted application to confirm arbitration award; claim that appeal was moot because plaintiff failed to file opposition to application to confirm arbitration award or to address application to confirm in its brief to this court; whether parties could agree to have three month limitation period in Federal Arbitration Act (9 U.S.C. § 12) to file application to vacate arbitration award apply to a vacatur proceeding in Connecticut state court so as to supplant or override thirty day limitation period under state law (§ 52-420 [b]); Doctor's Associates, Inc. v. Searl (179 Conn. App. 577) overruled insofar as it stands for proposition that parties can, as matter of law, agree, by way of choice of law provision, to apply three month limitation period in 9 U.S.C. § 12 to vacatur proceeding brought in Connecticut state court; claim that trial court erred when it reviewed substance of application to vacate arbitration award after it ruled that application to vacate should be dismissed; harmless error; whether trial court abused its discretion in awarding supplemental attorney's fees; claim that trial court was required to adopt findings of another trial court regarding reasonableness of hourly rates that were requested by defendants' counsel in motion for award of supplemental attorney's fees.</i>	
Berthiaume v. State, 192 CA 322.	80A
<i>Petition for new trial; burglary in first degree; summary judgment; jurisdiction; res judicata; motion for new trial; petition for new trial based on newly discovered evidence; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment on basis of res judicata; whether criminal court lack authority under applicable rule of practice (§ 42-55) to rule on petitioner's claim of newly discovered evidence; whether</i>	

(continued on next page)

- criminal court rendered valid, final decision on petitioner's motion for new trial; whether res judicata precluded petition for new trial in petitioner's subsequent civil action.*
- Boreen v. Boreen, 192 CA 303 61A
Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court erred in granting motion to terminate alimony upon court's finding that plaintiff was living with another person; whether trial court erred in finding that plaintiff was living with another person pursuant to statute (§ 46b-86 [b]); claim that trial court improperly relied on fact that plaintiff was provided with free health insurance coverage in concluding that she was living with another person; whether trial court erred in finding that only remedy available upon finding that plaintiff was living with another person was to terminate defendant's alimony obligation.
- Carolina v. Commissioner of Correction, 192 CA 296 54A
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that petitioner's right to due process was violated when respondent Commissioner of Correction classified him as sex offender with treatment needs, where petitioner had been convicted of various counts of risk of injury to child; claim that petitioner was not afforded sufficient procedural protections before being classified as sex offender.
- Gaddy v. Mount Vernon Fire Ins. Co., 192 CA 337 95A
Summary judgment; whether trial court improperly concluded that plaintiff's claims were barred by applicable statute of limitations; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as statement of facts and applicable law on issues.
- One Elmcroft Stamford, LLC v. Zoning Board of Appeals, 192 CA 275 33A
Zoning; claim that trial court improperly concluded that named applicant had standing on behalf of defendant business to apply to zoning board of appeals for approval of location of used car dealer on certain real property; claim that board failed to conduct requisite suitability analysis as required by applicable statute (§ 14-55); whether § 14-55 has been repealed; whether board should have reviewed application under standard set forth in § 14-55; whether board mistakenly treated application as if it were application for variance and, thus, failed to comply with requirements set forth in § 14-55 in granting that application; whether trial court erred in searching beyond board's stated reason for approval to find basis for board's decision and improperly upheld that decision on alternative grounds.
- State v. Watson, 192 CA 353 111A
Strangulation in second degree; assault in third degree; unlawful restraint in first degree; threatening in second degree; unpreserved claim that it was improper for trial court, rather than jury, to make determination of whether charges of assault and unlawful restraint were upon same incident as charge of strangulation for purposes of applicable statute ([Rev. to 2015] § 53a-64bb [b]); claim that trial court violated § 53a-64bb (b) and defendant's right to be free from double jeopardy when it punished him for assault, unlawful restraint and strangulation because separate charges of assault and unlawful restraint, as charged in information and based on evidence, were not established as wholly separate claims from stran-

(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.

gulation; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional rights to confrontation and to present defense by restricting his cross-examination of victim; claim that defendant should have been allowed to question victim regarding certain past conduct.

Volume 192 Cumulative Table of Cases 137A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

State Elections Enforcement Commission—Declaratory Ruling 2019—03. 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel 1C
