

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 12

September 17, 2019

307 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Connecticut Interlocal Risk Management Agency v. Jackson, 333 C 206.	32
<i>Negligence; summary judgment; proof of causation; application of alternative liability doctrine when conduct of multiple defendants is tortious and plaintiff's injuries have been caused by conduct of only one defendant but it is unclear which one; claim that trial court improperly failed to apply alternative liability doctrine in granting defendants' motions for summary judgment; application of alternative liability rule pursuant to which plaintiff's burden of proving causation shifts to each defendant to show that he or she did not cause plaintiff's injuries; elements required for application of alternative liability doctrine, discussed; whether application of doctrine to defendants in present case was unfair or compromised any legitimate reliance interest that they may have had.</i>	
State v. Elmer G., 333 C 176	2
<i>Sexual assault second degree; risk of injury to child; criminal violation of restraining order; certification from Appellate Court; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of criminal violation of restraining order; claim that trial court's explanation of temporary restraining order was unclear such that jury could not reasonably determine that defendant knew he was prohibited from contacting his children outside of weekly, supervised visits; claim that defendant was not adequately informed in his primary language that he was prohibited from contacting children by text or letter; claim that defendant did not violate restraining order when he sent letter to victim because evidence was insufficient to establish that he sent letter while restraining order was in effect; claim that defendant was deprived of fair trial as result of certain alleged improprieties committed by prosecutor; claim that prosecutor improperly bolstered credibility of certain witnesses; claim that prosecutor made golden rule argument when he asked jurors to consider their own perspectives; claim that prosecutor improperly referred to victim's credibility in light of psychological, social and physical barriers she faced in accusing defendant of sexual assault; claim that prosecutor improperly asked jurors whether other individuals in similar circumstances would fabricate sexual assault accusations.</i>	
Volume 333 Cumulative Table of Cases	51

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Abrams v. Commissioner of Correction, 192 CA 850	218A
<i>Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in concluding that counsel who represented petitioner with respect to appeal of habeas court's denial of first habeas petition did not render ineffective assistance for withdrawing appeal at petitioner's direction; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner's appellate habeas counsel was not ineffective in failing to advise petitioner regarding right to proceed as self-represented party.</i>	
Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC v. Frimel, 192 CA 786	154A
<i>Foreclosure; motion for summary judgment; whether trial court erred in granting motion for summary judgment without motion appearing on short calendar and without permitting oral argument on motion.</i>	
Callahan v. Callahan, 192 CA 634	2A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting defendant's postjudgment motion to modify his alimony obligation; claim that trial</i>	

(continued on next page)

court's finding that defendant's earning capacity had decreased, on basis of profits from parties' companies, was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court was required to determine defendant's earning capacity on basis of what he might theoretically earn if he were to sell companies and pursue employment opportunities in marketplace; whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering that modification of defendant's alimony obligation be retroactive three years and requiring plaintiff to repay defendant certain sums of alimony she had received; whether claim that trial court lacked authority to suspend defendant's alimony payments was moot where trial court had factored suspension of alimony payments into calculation of defendant's overpayment of alimony and reduced overpayment by amount of alimony that accrued during suspension; claim that trial court on remand from Appellate Court improperly failed to determine that reinstated financial orders were effective as of date of dissolution judgment; claim that trial court erred in ordering plaintiff to execute certain documents to transfer to defendant her interest in parties' companies; claim that trial court improperly concluded that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction to require defendant to endorse insurance checks for postdissolution property damage to parties' former marital home.

Ditech Financial, LLC v. Joseph, 192 CA 826 194A

Strict foreclosure; standing; claim that trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction due to named plaintiff's lack of standing; reviewability of claim that named plaintiff lacked standing, where this court was unable to verify in record before it what was presented to and reviewed by trial court, and resolution of standing claim was dependent on disputed factual findings that could not be resolved due to inadequate appellate record.

JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Virgulak, 192 CA 688. 56A

Foreclosure; reformation; claim that trial court erred by failing to exercise discretion in considering substitute plaintiff's foreclosure claim as stand-alone claim that was not dependent on reformation of mortgage deed; claim that trial court improperly failed to grant equitable remedy of foreclosure; whether trial court abused its discretion in declining to reform mortgage deed; whether substitute plaintiff provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that mutual mistake was made; claim that trial court improperly denied substitute plaintiff's motion to withdraw and amend responses to requests for admission; claim that trial court improperly concluded that substitute plaintiff's admissions limited recovery under its unjust enrichment claim; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for reargument.

Ledyard v. WMS Gaming, Inc., 192 CA 836. 204A

Personal property taxes; attorney's fees; summary judgment; whether, pursuant to statute (§ 12-161a) that requires property owner to pay attorney's fees of municipality in action brought to collect delinquent personal property taxes when fees are "as a result of and directly related to" collection proceeding, plaintiff town was entitled to attorney's fees it incurred in defending collateral federal action; claim that trial court improperly granted plaintiff town's motion for summary judgment because it improperly applied expansive interpretation of § 12-161a to

(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.

characterize attorney’s fees incurred in federal action as falling within ambit of fees directly related to present collection proceeding; whether attorney’s fees attributable to federal action were directly related to present collection proceeding.

McCarthy v. Commissioner of Correction, 192 CA 797 165A
Habeas corpus; due process; ineffective assistance of counsel; whether petitioner procedurally defaulted due process claim that his decision to reject plea offer was not made knowingly and voluntarily because he was misled regarding strength of state’s case against him; whether petitioner’s due process claim was freestanding claim subject to procedural default; whether petitioner established cause even if he had procedurally defaulted his due process claim; claim that counsel for bond purposes only had rendered ineffective assistance by causing petitioner to misunderstand strength of state’s case against him by fabricating witnesses’ affidavits without petitioner’s knowledge; whether claim that nonappearing counsel who was not counsel of record rendered ineffective assistance was cognizable as matter of law; whether ineffective assistance of counsel claims are limited to actions taken by attorneys who are counsel of record or who appeared in court; whether counsel for bond purposes only was representing petitioner for purposes of sixth amendment when he fabricated witnesses’ affidavits.

Reale v. Rhode Island, 192 CA 759 127A
Spoliation of evidence; claim that trial court erred in determining that defendants did not waive right to seek dismissal for lack of personal jurisdiction by concurrently moving to strike plaintiff’s complaint as alternative to dismissal; claim that trial court erred in granting motions to dismiss on ground of lack of personal jurisdiction; whether claims against state defendants were barred by doctrine of sovereign immunity; whether trial court properly exercised its discretion to allow town defendant to file motion to dismiss and motion to strike simultaneously; whether town defendant was considered foreign corporation within meaning of long arm statute that sets forth service of process on foreign corporations by Connecticut resident (§ 33-929 [f]).

State v. Coltherst, 192 CA 738 106A
Capital felony; murder; felony murder; kidnapping in first degree; robbery in first degree; robbery in second degree; larceny in first degree; conspiracy to commit kidnapping in first degree; larceny in fourth degree; motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court improperly failed to account adequately for defendant’s youth at time defendant committed underlying crimes; claim that trial court improperly afforded defendant opportunity to provide additional remarks to court in violation of defendant’s rights to counsel, due process and allocution; whether trial court properly resentenced defendant; whether statute governing sentencing of child (§ 54-91g) creates presumption against imposition of sentence of life imprisonment on juvenile defendant; whether trial court was required to make finding that defendant was incorrigible, irreparably corrupt or irretrievably depraved before it properly could sentence defendant to life imprisonment or equivalent; whether trial court’s sentence was supported by record from resentencing hearing; whether trial court properly considered factors set forth in § 54-91g; whether trial court afforded defendant ample opportunity to provide personal statement before being resentenced; whether trial court interfered with defendant’s attorney-client relationship; reviewability of claim that court’s invitation to defendant to provide additional remarks violated his rights to allocution and due process; failure to brief claim adequately.

Weinshel, Wynnicks & Associates, LLC v. Bongiorno, 192 CA 768. 136A
Contracts; claim that trial court improperly concluded that individual defendant could not be held personally liable for plaintiff’s damages pursuant to theory of successor liability; whether trial court properly rendered judgment in favor of defendant, individually; claim that defendant was liable on ground that she did not obtain approval, pursuant to applicable state regulation (§ 30-6-A4), from Liquor Control Commission for acquisition of interest in liquor company; whether plaintiff provided support for claim that party may seek to enforce liquor control regulation by means of private cause of action; claim that § 30-6-A4 stands for proposition that unapproved transfer of interest in corporate backer of liquor permit exposes transferee to personal liability for debts of backer corporation; whether trial court improperly interpreted statute (§ 52-599 [b]) in finding that substitution of defendant, as executrix, for husband’s estate was untimely.

Volume 192 Cumulative Table of Cases 233A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

DSS—Medicaid Access Monitoring Review Plan - Triennial Update for Public Comment. 1C
CRSA—Notice of Intent to Adopt Procedure 2C

MISCELLANEOUS

Notices of Suspension 1D
