


# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 11

September 10, 2019

415 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Riley v. Travelers Home & Marine Ins. Co., 333 C 60. . . . .	2
<i>Breach of contract; negligent infliction of emotional distress; motion for directed verdict pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 16-37); applicability of waiver rule; whether evidence was sufficient to support jury's verdict with respect to plaintiff's claim of negligent infliction of emotional distress; reviewability of claim that waiver rule is inapplicable in civil cases in which trial court reserved decision on motion for directed verdict; claim that trial court was limited to considering evidence adduced in plaintiff's case-in-chief when it ruled on defendant's motion for judgment notwithstanding verdict.</i>	
State v. Leniart, 333 C 88. . . . .	30
<i>Capital felony; murder; certification from Appellate Court; whether unpreserved sufficiency claim under state common-law corpus delicti rule was reviewable on appeal; whether there was sufficient, corroborating evidence, independent of defendant's confessions, to sustain defendant's conviction; purpose, history, and scope of corpus delicti rule, discussed; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court's improper exclusion of video recording depicting polygraph pretest interview constituted harmful error; definition of categorically inadmissible polygraph evidence under State v. Porter (241 Conn. 57), discussed; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had abused its discretion in excluding expert testimony regarding credibility of incarcerated informants.</i>	
State v. Robert H., 333 C 172 . . . . .	114
<i>Risk of injury to child; violation of probation; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that corpus delicti is rule of admissibility; resolution of defendant's claim controlled by this court's decision in State v. Leniart (333 Conn. 88).</i>	
Volume 333 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	119

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Alvarez v. Middletown, 192 CA 606 . . . . .	230A
<i>Employment discrimination; alleged discrimination on basis of national origin and race; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of defendant; whether plaintiff failed to demonstrate existence of genuine issue of material fact as to whether defendant's nondiscriminatory justification for his discharge from his employment was pretext for unlawful discrimination on basis of national origin and race; whether circumstances of case implicated same actor inference; whether certain internal affairs report reflected discriminatory bias that influenced recommendation of defendant city's chief of police to discharge plaintiff.</i>	
Amica Mutual Ins. Co. v. Levine, 192 CA 620 . . . . .	244A
<i>Declaratory judgment; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment; claim that requirement in automobile insurance policy issued by plaintiff that required defendant to undergo independent medical examination was void as against public policy; claim that provision in automobile insurance policy that required defendant to undergo independent medical examination was reasonable; claim that defendant's refusal to attend independent medical examination was unreasonable; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of relevant facts, issues and applicable law.</i>	

(continued on next page)

*Blinn v. Sindwani*, 192 CA 525 . . . . . 149A  
*Negligence; claim that the trial court improperly sustained defendant’s objection to plaintiff’s motions in limine, which sought to exclude certain prior misconduct evidence and evidence of motor vehicle citation issued to plaintiff; whether evidence was relevant to plaintiff’s claim of damages; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining the probative value of evidence outweighed its prejudicial effect.*

*Crosskey Architects, LLC v. POKO Partners, LLC*, 192 CA 378 . . . . . 2A  
*Contracts; quantum meruit; whether trial court improperly pierced corporate veil and held defendant business owners personally liable under identity rule; claim that trial court improperly found that identity test was satisfied based solely on its finding that defendant business owners controlled defendant business entities; claim that plaintiff presented no evidence to support identity rule; claim that trial court improperly pierced corporate veil and held defendant business owners personally liable under identity rule because it failed to properly consider whether defendant business entities served legitimate business purpose; claim that trial court improperly found that plaintiff was entitled to damages on theory of quantum meruit as to certain project; claim that trial court improperly calculated amount of damages because no factual support existed in record for value of benefit; claim that trial court lacked discretion to award prejudgment interest pursuant to statute (§ 37-3a) on claim for quantum meruit as to certain project.*

*Fleischer v. Fleischer*, 192 CA 540 . . . . . 164A  
*Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court erred in dismissing motions to modify alimony and for contempt for failure to prosecute motions with reasonable diligence; whether sanction of dismissal was proportional to violation.*

*Iino v. Spalter*, 192 CA 421 . . . . . 45A  
*Intentional sexual assault; motion to dismiss; personal jurisdiction; motion to set aside verdict; punitive damages; claim that trial court’s assertion of personal jurisdiction over defendant violated her right to due process because she personally had no minimum contacts with state; whether trial court properly exercised jurisdiction over defendant under state’s long arm statute (§ 52-59b); whether defendant, as executrix of decedent’s estate, stepped into decedent’s shoes for purposes of this action; claim that trial court improperly admitted certain evidence; whether any purported error in admission of evidence was harmless; whether evidence merely was cumulative of other evidence; whether defendant failed to prove that improper admission of evidence likely affected outcome of trial; whether jury’s determination that plaintiff was entitled to common-law punitive damages was final judgment for purposes of appeal; whether trial court improperly permitted jury to find defendant liable for common-law punitive damages without evidence as to plaintiff’s litigation expenses; whether trial court improperly reserved for its own consideration specific amount of common-law punitive damages to be awarded to plaintiff; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to set aside verdict; whether there was insufficient evidence that plaintiff suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder and other psychological trauma caused by childhood sexual abuse by decedent.*

(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.

Ives v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles, 192 CA 587 . . . . . 211A  
*Administrative appeal; suspension of motor vehicle operator's license by defendant Commissioner of Motor Vehicles pursuant to statute (§ 14-227b); claim that trial court erred in concluding that blood test results need not satisfy conditions for admissibility and competence set forth by statute (§ 14-227a [k]) that applies to criminal proceedings to be admissible in administrative license suspension hearing; claim that trial court improperly interpreted 2009 amendment to § 14-227b (j) as changing requirements for admissibility of chemical evidence at administrative hearing; claim that because plaintiff did not suffer and was not alleged to have suffered physical injury in accident as required by § 14-227a (k), his blood sample was improperly obtained; whether trial court properly determined that blood test derived from plaintiff's blood sample satisfied conditions for admissibility in underlying administrative hearing before defendant; whether legislative history of 2009 amendment to § 14-227b (j) demonstrated that its purpose was to extend factual circumstances in which blood test results derived from blood samples are admissible in administrative proceedings under § 14-227b (j) to include accident situations where operator of motor vehicle, regardless of physical injury or alleged physical injury, is determined by police officer to require treatment or observation at hospital; reviewability of claim that permitting introduction of blood test results absent satisfaction of admissibility conditions set forth in § 14-227a (k) was unconstitutional; failure to raise claim in administrative hearing; whether unreserved claim was reviewable under State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233).*

Pasco Common Condominium Assn., Inc. v. Benson, 192 CA 479 . . . . . 103A  
*Contracts; Common Interest Ownership Act (§ 47-200 et seq.); action to recover damages for alleged violations of condominium declaration; whether trial court improperly determined that statute of limitations applicable to action was tolled until commencement of this action, rather than to until period of time when declarant control ended under declaration; whether trial court improperly interpreted applicable statutes and declaration to conclude that period of declarant control could continue beyond ten year limit established in declaration so long as one of terminating events in applicable statute (§ 47-245 [d]) and declaration did not occur; whether timeliness of action was contingent on whether three year tort statute of limitations (§ 52-577) or six year contract statute of limitations (§ 52-576) applied; whether claim that declarant had duty to record correct unit square footage in amendments to declaration sounded in tort and contract; whether claims that defendants made secret arrangement with owner of restaurant to exempt restaurant from paying common charges, that defendants improperly assessed common charges related to improper wiring of certain common area lighting, and that defendants improperly expended funds of association to finance repairs and maintenance for units and for paving expenses sounded in tort and contract; whether claims of self-dealing and breach of fiduciary duty relating to management fee and personal vehicle expenses were tort claims only; whether trial court's award of damages to association for common charges that should have been assessed to restaurant was proper; whether court's decision to pierce corporate veil and hold defendant individually liable was clearly erroneous.*

Seminole Realty, LLC v. Sekretaev, 192 CA 405 . . . . . 29A  
*Foreclosure; claim that trial court abused its discretion in granting application and execution for ejectment and denying motion for stay of execution for ejectment; whether law day was extended by sixty days pursuant to bankruptcy court's order suspending relief from automatic bankruptcy stay under provision of United States Bankruptcy Code (11 U.S.C. § 362 [a]); whether defendant, who failed to redeem by extended law day, had right or interest in property; claim that trial court improperly found that defendant had agreed to revised law day.*

Vodovskaia-Scandura v. Hartford Headache Center, LLC, 192 CA 559 . . . . . 183A  
*Negligence; intentional infliction of emotional distress; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment as to claims of negligence and intentional infliction of emotional distress; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of relevant facts, issues and applicable law.*

Volume 192 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 259A

**SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES**

Summaries . . . . . 1B

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Notice of Administrative Suspension of Attorneys . . . . . 1C