

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 17

October 22, 2019

239 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Bowens v. Commissioner of Correction, 333 C 502.	2
<i>Habeas corpus; certification to appeal; claim of actual innocence; claim that identification procedures used in connection with petitioner's criminal conviction were so unreliable and unnecessarily suggestive, that they violated petitioner's constitutional right to due process; claim of ineffective assistance of habeas counsel; claim that habeas court incorrectly concluded that petitioner's claim of cruel and unusual punishment with respect to petitioner's sentence was barred by doctrine of res judicata; application of holdings in recent cases, State v. McCleese (333 Conn. 378) and State v. Williams-Bey (333 Conn. 468), to resolve petitioner's claim of cruel and unusual punishment.</i>	
State v. McCleese (replacement pages), 333 CR 403–404	v
State v. McCleese (replacement pages), 333 CR 417–28	vii
Volume 333 Cumulative Table of Cases	43

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of America, National Assn. v. Derisme (Memorandum Decision), 193 CA 903	163A
Commerce Park Associates, LLC v. Robbins, 193 CA 697	91A
<i>Contracts; landlord-tenant; negligence; claim that trial court improperly awarded landlord additional rent for period between November, 2014, through third full week of April, 2015, on basis of its implicit factual finding that premises were fully tenantable during that period and, therefore, that landlord was entitled to receive full amount of rent due under lease, rather than partial payments tendered by tenant; whether there was evidence in record supporting trial court's calculation of back rent owed by tenant; claim that trial court improperly found that tenant was constructively evicted from premises as result of serious and frequent sewer backups; whether record supported trial court's finding that tenant did not vacate premises before landlord had notice and reasonable opportunity to correct problems with building's sewer system; claim that trial court improperly awarded compensatory damages to tenant on theory of gross negligence because Connecticut common law does not recognize degrees of negligence or cause of action sounding in gross negligence; claim that it was improper for trial court to have awarded damages on basis of gross negligence because it was never pleaded by tenant; claim that trial court improperly determined amount of damages awarded to tenant by incorrectly determining that proper measure of tenant's damages was its loss of beneficial use of substantial improvements it had made to premises prior to constructive eviction and that court should have, instead, limited its award of damages to loss of fair market value of lease; whether trial court miscalculated amount of damages awarded to tenant for loss of beneficial use of substantial improvements tenant had made to premises.</i>	
Daniel W. E. v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 193 CA 905	165A
Fernandez v. Commissioner of Correction, 193 CA 746	140A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly dismissed petitioner's third petition for writ of habeas corpus; whether petition failed to state claim upon which habeas relief could be granted; whether petitioner could assert claim for relief under Rules of Professional Conduct; claim that neither rule 1.10 nor rule 3.7 of Rules of Professional Conduct required disqualification of attorneys in all of state's attorney's offices and Office of Chief State's Attorney; whether petitioner provided basis</i>	

(continued on next page)

for any conclusion that his statements to prosecutor during plea negotiations while petitioner was self-represented were privileged; whether claim that prosecutor's potential testimony regarding petitioner's statements would have been inadmissible and that prosecutor's testimony effectively prevented petitioner from testifying in his own defense was based on speculation.

Labarge v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 193 CA 904. 164A
 Lampert v. Lampert (Memorandum Decision), 193 CA 905 165A
 New Haven v. Ferrucci (Memorandum Decision), 193 CA 905 165A
 Robbins Eye Center, P.C. v. Commerce Park Associates, LLC (See Commerce Park Associates, LLC v. Robbins), 193 CA 697 91A
 State v. Lynch, 193 CA 637. 31A

Operating motor vehicle while under influence of intoxicating liquor; failure to appear in second degree; criminal trespass in first degree; motion to withdraw guilty pleas; whether trial court abused its discretion in failing to conduct evidentiary hearing with respect to motion to withdraw guilty pleas; whether defendant failed to provide adequate factual basis to support further hearing; whether defense counsel's assertion that plea canvass was deficient for failing to specify that defendant's driver's license could be revoked permanently was reason among grounds enumerated in applicable rule of practice (§ 39-27) for withdrawal of plea; claim that trial court should have granted motion to withdraw guilty pleas, pursuant to § 39-27, on ground that defense counsel was ineffective; whether trial court abused its discretion by failing to conduct evidentiary hearing prior to terminating defendant's participation in alcohol education program.

Thunelius v. Posacki, 193 CA 666 60A

Child custody; guardian ad litem; child support; protective order; claim that trial court improperly delegated its decision-making authority to nonjudicial entity when it defined duties and responsibilities of guardian ad litem of parties' minor child; whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering that prevailing party in any postjudgment dispute adjudicated by court between parties after unsuccessful mediation with the guardian ad litem be reimbursed by other party for his or her share of guardian ad litem's fees; whether amount of any future fees and parties' respective financial capacities to pay such fees was purely speculative; whether claim that trial court improperly appointed guardian ad litem without having complied with certain statutory requirements was moot; whether there was practical relief that this court could afford defendant; whether trial court abused its discretion in sua sponte issuing protective order; whether language of order clearly indicated that court intended order to function as protective order issued pursuant to Yontef v. Yontef (185 Conn. 275); whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering parties to enroll child in private school through high school and to divide payments for that schooling; whether there was evidence of cost of private high school or that parties had ever agreed on child attending private high school; claim that trial court improperly relied on child support guidelines worksheet in issuing its child support orders; reviewability of claim that trial court, by failing to order plaintiff to reimburse defendant for certain expenses he allegedly should have paid

(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.

in accordance with prior stipulation between parties, in effect, granted plaintiff retroactive modification of pendente lite orders to pay those expenses.

U.S. Bank Trust, N.A. v. Theodore (Memorandum Decision), 193 CA 904 164A

Wager v. Moore, 193 CA 608 2A

Negligence; claim that trial court erred in denying motion to set aside verdict and for new trial; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support jury's finding of contributory negligence; claim that trial court erred in instructing jury on contributory negligence when instruction was not supported by evidence; claim that trial court failed to instruct jury on law essential to plaintiff's claim regarding defendant's negligence; claim that once trial court instructed jury on pedestrian's duties pursuant to relevant statutes (§§ 14-300b [a] and 14-300c [b]), its refusal to charge jury on countervailing duties driver owes to pedestrians pursuant to relevant statutes (§§ 14-300d and 14-300i) constituted error; claim that improper hearsay evidence was introduced against plaintiff during videotaped deposition testimony of defendant's toxicology expert.

Volume 193 Cumulative Table of Cases 167A

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Reinstatement of Attorney 1B