

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

---

VOL. LXXXI No. 18                      October 29, 2019                      323 Pages

---

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Dinham v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 333 C 927 . . . . .	67
Gudino v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 333 C 924 . . . . .	64
IP Media Products, LLC v. Success, Inc. (Order), 333 C 926 . . . . .	66
Meriden v. Freedom of Information Commission (Order), 333 C 926 . . . . .	66
Monroe v. Ostrosky (Order), 333 C 926 . . . . .	66
Newtown v. Ostrosky (Order), 333 C 925 . . . . .	65
State v. Burton (Order), 333 C 927 . . . . .	67
State v. Juan V. (Order), 333 C 925 . . . . .	65
State v. Lewis, 333 C 543 . . . . .	3
<i>Carrying pistol without permit; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had properly determined that seizure and patdown of defendant were lawful under federal and state constitutions and, therefore, had properly denied defendant's motion to suppress; claim that defendant was unlawfully seized when police officer stopped patrol vehicle and asked for his name or, alternatively, when officer exited his vehicle and approached defendant while asking him questions; whether officer had reasonable and articulable suspicion to seize defendant when officer commenced patdown search; claim that officer did not have reasonable and articulable suspicion that defendant might be armed and dangerous; interplay between domestic violence and reasonable and articulable suspicion that suspect is armed and dangerous, discussed.</i>	
State v. Porfil (Order), 333 C 923 . . . . .	63
State v. Riley (Order), 333 C 923 . . . . .	63
Stone v. East Coast Swappers, LLC (Order), 333 C 924 . . . . .	64
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Melahn (Order), 333 C 923 . . . . .	63
Volume 333 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	69
Peters v. Senman, 193 CA 766 . . . . .	2A
<i>Child custody; motion for modification of custody; motion for declaratory judgment; reviewability of claim that trial court abused its discretion by terminating portion of certain rights provided to plaintiff under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.) without conducting a fitness hearing; failure to brief claim adequately; claim that trial court erred in dismissing motions for declaratory judgment; whether plaintiff lacked standing to request declaratory judgment; claim that trial court erred in denying motion for modification of custody; whether evidence supported factual determination that there had been no change in circumstances; claim that trial court erred in awarding defendant portion of attorney's fees.</i>	
State v. Sentementes (Memorandum Decision), 193 CA 906 . . . . .	106A
State v. Ward, 193 CA 794 . . . . .	30A
<i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; manslaughter in first degree; assault in first degree; unpreserved claim that defendant's due process rights, under federal constitution, were violated when trial court failed to refer motion to correct sentence imposed in illegal manner to sentencing judge; whether due process required that sentencing court hear and adjudicate motion to correct illegal sentence; whether trial court properly dismissed motion to correct illegal sentence for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether defendant failed to set forth colorable claim that sentence was imposed in illegal manner; claim that defendant was incompetent at time of sentencing.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Summit Saugatuck, LLC v. Water Pollution Control Authority, 193 CA 823 . . . . . 59A  
*Administrative appeal; appeal from denial of application for sewer extension by defendant water pollution control authority; whether decision to grant conditional approval of sewer extension application was properly left to discretion of defendant; whether trial court impermissibly substituted its own discretion and judgment for that of defendant by overriding its decision denying sewer extension application and ordering conditional approval of application; whether defendant's rationale for denying application was illegal, arbitrary, or constituted abuse of discretion; whether fact that conditional approval of application was viable option available to agency in considering application meant that agency had to exercise that option whenever possible; whether record supported claim that defendant had practice to refrain from granting conditional approvals.*

Wozniak v. Colchester, 193 CA 842 . . . . . 78A  
*Writ of mandamus; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of defendant; mootness; motion to dismiss appeal; claim that plaintiffs were entitled to writ of mandamus to compel defendant town to file application for letter of map revision on plaintiffs' behalf with federal agency; claim that federal regulations (44 C.F.R. §§ 65.3 and 65.7) imposed ministerial duty on defendant to file letter of map revision application on plaintiffs' behalf; claim that appeal was subject to dismissal as moot due to pending study conducted by federal agency; whether plaintiffs had no adequate legal remedy other than writ of mandamus.*

Volume 193 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 107A

Grogan v. Penza, 194 CA 72 . . . . . 188A  
*Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court properly denied motion for contempt; whether language of separation agreement that was incorporated into dissolution judgment was clear and unambiguous; whether trial court abused its discretion in declining to award attorney's fees to plaintiff.*

In re Anthony L., 194 CA 111 . . . . . 227A  
*Termination of parental rights; reviewability of claim that trial court violated substantive due process rights of respondent mother and her minor children when it failed to determine whether permanency plans for children that were proposed by respondent Commissioner of Children and Families secured more permanent and stable life for them compared to that which she could provide if she were given time to rehabilitate herself.*

In re Kadon M., 194 CA 100 . . . . . 216A  
*Child neglect; transfer of guardianship of minor child; claim that trial court abused its discretion by denying oral motion of attorney for minor child to appoint guardian ad litem; whether trial court required input of guardian ad litem in order to determine best interests of minor child; whether trial court's denial of motion to appoint guardian ad litem precluded respondent mother or attorney for minor child from presenting evidence for trial court to weigh and consider in conducting its best interests analysis; whether mother explained how trial court's failure to appoint guardian ad litem would have affected trial.*

(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.

Tatoian v. Tyler, 194 CA 1 . . . . . 117A  
*Vexatious litigation; trusts; whether trial court properly denied motion to dismiss plaintiff trustee's action for vexatious litigation; claim that trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction because trustee lacked standing at time he commenced action; claim that trial court improperly failed to consider whether settlor of trust was subjected to undue influence in connection with creation of trust; claim that trial court misinterpreted relevant law in its analysis of whether defendant beneficiaries had probable cause in prior action against trustee to claim that trustee failed to diversify trust's assets in violation of statute (§ 45a-541c); claim that trial court misinterpreted relevant law in its analysis of whether trustee could prevail merely by demonstrating that beneficiaries lacked probable cause to bring one of several claims beneficiaries brought against trustee in prior action; claim that trial court improperly analyzed whether beneficiaries had probable cause to bring claims against trustee in prior action where court essentially disallowed reliance by trustee on trust's exculpatory clause to demonstrate that beneficiaries lacked probable cause.*  
Volume 194 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 237A

**SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES**

Summaries . . . . . 1B

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Notice of Suspension of Attorney . . . . . 1C