

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 16 October 15, 2019 257 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Bank of America, N.A. v. Cuseo (Order), 333 C 922	136
Bolat v. Bolat (Order), 333 C 918	132
Clasby v. Zimmerman (Order), 333 C 919	133
DeMaria v. Bridgeport (Order), 333 C 916	130
Farmington-Girard, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission (Order), 333 C 917	131
Federal National Mortgage Assn. v. Farina (Order), 333 C 920	134
Griffin v. Commissioner of Correction, 333 C 480.	104
<i>Habeas corpus; motion for summary judgment; certification from habeas court; claim that contemporary standards of decency regarding acceptable punishment for children who engage in criminal conduct have evolved such that transfer of case of fourteen year old defendant to regular criminal docket from docket for juvenile matters and subsequent sentence of forty years violated prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment in due process provisions (article first, §§ 8 and 9) of state constitution; whether recent statutory (P.A. 15-183 and P.A. 15-84) modifications to state's juvenile justice system reflect changes in contemporary standards of decency; whether petitioner was entitled to be resentenced.</i>	
Halladay v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 333 C 921	135
Harris v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 333 C 919	133
Kaminski v. Poirot (Order), 333 C 916	130
Lewis v. Newtown (Order), 333 C 919	133
Lowry v. Mayers (Order), 333 C 922	136
McGinty v. Stamford Police Dept. (Order), 333 C 920	134
Nonhuman Rights Project, Inc. v. R.W. Commerford & Sons, Inc. (Order), 333 C 920. . .	134
Pamela Corp. v. Planning & Zoning Commission (Order) (See Farmington-Girard, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission), 333 C 917.	131
Patrowicz v. Peloquin (Order), 333 C 915	129
Riccardo v. Couloute (Order), 333 C 921.	135
State v. Daniels (Orders), 333 C 918	132
State v. McCleese, 333 C 378.	2
<i>Murder; conspiracy to commit murder; assault first degree; whether trial court properly dismissed motion to correct illegal sentence for lack of jurisdiction on ground of mootness; claim that, under Connecticut constitution, parole eligibility afforded by recent legislation (P.A. 15-84, § 1) to certain juvenile offenders did not remedy violation of requirement in Miller v. Alabama (567 U.S. 460) and State v. Riley (315 Conn. 637) that juvenile offender's age and hallmarks of adolescence be considered as mitigating factors before juvenile may be sentenced to life imprisonment, or its functional equivalent, without possibility of parole; claim that P.A. 15-84 is unconstitutional under separation of powers doctrine embodied in article two of Connecticut constitution and due process clause of fourteenth amendment to United States constitution; claim that P.A. 15-84 violated separation of powers by impermissibly delegating sentencing power to Board of Pardons and Paroles; claim that P.A. 15-84 violates defendant's right to equal protection under fourteenth amendment to United States constitution on ground that juveniles convicted of capital felony are entitled to resentencing under P.A. 15-84 whereas juveniles, such as defendant, who are convicted of murder, are not.</i>	
State v. Pugh (Order), 333 C 914	128
State v. Scott (Order), 333 C 917	131

(continued on next page)

State v. Turner (Order), 333 C 915 129

State v. Williams-Bey, 333 C 468. 92

Murder as accessory; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly upheld trial court's dismissal of motion to correct illegal sentence for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that defendant was entitled to resentencing under Connecticut constitution after passage of P.A. 15-84, which requires sentencing court to consider juvenile offender's age and hallmarks of adolescence as mitigating factors in determining sentence when court imposes sentence of life, or its functional equivalent, without possibility of parole; whether resentencing was required, when, following enactment of legislation (P.A. 15-84), defendant became eligible for parole and could no longer claim that he was serving life sentence, or its functional equivalent, without possibility of parole; resolution of defendant's claim controlled by this court's decision in State v. McCleese (333 Conn. 378).

Trust v. Bliss (Order), 333 C 921 135

U.S. Bank, National Assn. v. Fitzpatrick (Order), 333 C 916. 130

Wachovia Mortgage, FSB v. Toczek (Order), 333 C 914 128

Volume 333 Cumulative Table of Cases 137

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Jezouit v. Malloy, 193 CA 576 72A

Sovereign immunity; action concerning alleged illegal recording of telephonic communications by state officials; whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss complaint on ground of sovereign immunity; claim that only possible interpretation of statute (§ 52-570d) pertaining to recording of telephonic communications was that it impliedly waived sovereign immunity because it authorized an aggrieved person to bring action in Superior Court; claim that because § 52-570d (b) exempted from liability certain state officials, by necessary implication, it waived sovereign immunity from suit for state officials not so designated, such as defendants; claim that dismissal of complaint was improper because trial court failed to apply exception to sovereign immunity for claims of declaratory and injunctive relief.

Kelly v. Kurtz, 193 CA 507 3A

Contracts; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to set aside jury's verdict on counts alleging breach of supplementary agreement and breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; claim that evidence was insufficient to prove that plaintiff was terminated or prevented from working scheduling of his own choosing; claim that verdict was inconsistent; whether trial court abused its discretion in setting aside jury's verdict on claims that defendants invaded plaintiff's privacy by misappropriating his name after he was terminated, of tortious interference with business expectancies, of alleged violations of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.), and of unjust enrichment; whether plaintiff failed to prove that he suffered any damages as result of

(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.

defendants' use of his name; whether plaintiff failed to prove that he suffered actual loss as result of defendants' alleged interference with his business expectancies or that he suffered any ascertainable loss as result of alleged CUTPA violations; whether plaintiff could recover under theory of unjust enrichment where he recovered under theory of breach of contract; whether plaintiff lacked standing to bring claims relating to breach of operating agreement.

Meribear Productions, Inc. v. Frank, 193 CA 598 94A
Foreign judgment; breach of contract; quantum meruit; final judgment; motion to dismiss appeal as untimely; motion for permission to file late appeal; whether twenty day time limit for filing appeal pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 63-1) is subject matter jurisdictional; whether good cause existed to allow defendants' appeal to proceed.

State v. Crewe, 193 CA 564. 60A
Possession of narcotic substance; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support conviction; whether jury reasonably could have inferred from evidence that defendant knew of presence of narcotics in van, exercised dominion and control over at least some of narcotics and, thus, constructively possessed narcotics.

Weston Street Hartford, LLC v. Zebra Realty, LLC, 193 CA 542. 38A
Easements; temporary and permanent injunction; counterclaim; whether trial court properly rendered judgment for plaintiff on counts of defendant's counterclaim relating to its request to relocate plaintiff's right-of-way easement over defendant's property; difference between unilateral modification of easement and unilateral relocation of easement, discussed; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment in defendant's favor on plaintiff's complaint and denied plaintiff's request for injunctive relief; whether trial court applied correct standard of law in determining whether plaintiff was entitled to injunctive relief; whether court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's request for injunctive relief.

Volume 193 Cumulative Table of Cases 105A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B