

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

---

VOL. LXXXI No. 21                      November 19, 2019                      170 Pages

---

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Abrams v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 333 C 939 . . . . .	25
Autumn View, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission (Order), 333 C 942 . . . . .	28
Blinn v. Sindwani (Order), 333 C 940 . . . . .	26
Boreen v. Boreen (Order), 333 C 941 . . . . .	27
Callahan v. Callahan (Order), 333 C 939 . . . . .	25
Jackson v. Drury (Order), 333 C 938 . . . . .	24
Sen v. Tsiongas (Order), 333 C 940 . . . . .	26
Sobel v. Commissioner of Revenue Services, 333 C 712 . . . . .	2
<i>Income tax; administrative appeal; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that plaintiff taxpayer was entitled to state income tax credits, pursuant to statute (§ 12-704 [a] [1]), for nonresident income taxes he paid to New York on distributive share of profits he received for managing limited partnerships in New York; mootness; whether appeal was moot when appellant failed to challenge all independent bases for trial court's decision.</i>	
State v. Alicea (Order), 333 C 937 . . . . .	23
State v. Hathaway (Order), 333 C 937 . . . . .	23
State v. Marsan (Order), 333 C 939 . . . . .	25
State v. Mercer (Order), 333 C 938 . . . . .	24
State v. Rivera (Order), 333 C 937 . . . . .	23
State v. Watson (Order), 333 C 941 . . . . .	27
State v. Zavala (Order), 333 C 942 . . . . .	28
Vodovskaia-Scandura v. Hartford Headache Center, LLC (Order), 333 C 940 . . . . .	26
Volume 333 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	29

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Benchmark Municipal Tax Services, Ltd. v. Greenwood Manor, LLC, 194 CA 432 . . . . .	84A
<i>Foreclosure; tortious interference with business expectancy; whether trial court erred in finding that cross claim plaintiff failed to establish any tortious action by individual cross claim defendant; whether cross claim plaintiff alleged legal error or erroneous factual basis for trial court's decision on appeal; whether cross claim plaintiff demonstrated that trial court either misapplied law or relied on clearly erroneous factual findings; whether there was evidence to demonstrate that planning and zoning commission acted improperly in deciding not to change zoning designation of property.</i>	
Costello & McCormack, P.C. v. Manero, 194 CA 417 . . . . .	69A
<i>Legal malpractice; whether trial court properly concluded that cross claim set forth claim of legal malpractice; whether cross claim was operative complaint; whether complaint contained claim of legal malpractice; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment in favor of cross claim defendants on legal malpractice claim; whether cross claim plaintiff could make prima facie case of legal malpractice in absence of expert testimony.</i>	
M. M. v. H. F., 194 CA 472 . . . . .	124A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; request for leave to file motion to modify custody and visitation of minor child; whether trial court erred in denying request for leave to file motion to modify on ground that defendant failed to allege facts sufficient to constitute substantial change in circumstances and that motion simply reiterated allegations previously presented to court.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Robert S. v. Commissioner of Correction, 194 CA 382 . . . . . 34A  
*Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether petitioner failed to satisfy his burden of overcoming presumption that trial counsel’s decision not to raise intoxication defense was reasonable trial strategy; claim that had trial counsel properly investigated and informed petitioner of possible intoxication defense, there was reasonable probability that he would not have pleaded guilty; whether habeas court properly rejected petitioner’s claim that he was under influence of drugs at time of murders.*

Shear v. Shear, 194 CA 351. . . . . 3A  
*Dissolution of marriage; appeal to Superior Court from order of family support magistrate; motion for modification of child support; subject matter jurisdiction; whether appeal from order of family support magistrate was taken from final judgment; whether family support magistrate’s order regarding motion for modification fully dispose of that motion; whether family support magistrate’s order terminated separate and distinct proceeding or so concluded rights of parties that further proceedings could not affect them.*

State v. Carpenter, 194 CA 364 . . . . . 16A  
*Murder; arson in second degree; claim that trial court improperly declined to give jury instruction on third-party culpability; whether evidence was sufficient to establish direct connection between third party and murder of victim or arson of victim’s home.*

State v. Cecil, 194 CA 446 . . . . . 98A  
*Murder; criminal possession of firearm; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly admitted into evidence video recorded statements of witnesses; claim that trial court improperly admitted into evidence handgun magazine, which defendant claimed was irrelevant, highly prejudicial and misleading.*

State v. Pernell, 194 CA 394 . . . . . 46A  
*Murder; prosecutorial impropriety; whether defendant was deprived of his due process right to fair trial because of certain prosecutorial improprieties in closing argument; claim that prosecutor improperly opined on how someone should act during police interview because there was no evidence as to how grieving person typically would respond when questioned by police hours after witnessing his friend’s death, nor about how defendant’s ingestion of phencyclidine could have affected his behavior during police interview; claim that prosecutor improperly interjected his own experience by stating what he would have done if he had found himself in defendant’s circumstances; claim that prosecutor improperly appealed to jurors’ emotions when prosecutor speculated that defendant shamefully went through victim’s purse after her death and found letters regarding child custody issues; claim that prosecutor’s statement that defendant’s version of events, namely, that gun was in both his and victim’s hands at time of discharge, contradicted gunshot residue evidence was improper because it was not properly derived from evidence presented; claim that prosecutor’s use of words “kill shot” improperly appealed to jurors’ sympathies and emotions because those words implied more than mere murder; whether prosecutor’s use of word “executed” improperly*

(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.

*appealed to jurors' sympathies and emotions; whether prosecutor's statement of "[i]t's shameful" that defendant went through victim's purse after her death was improper expression of personal opinion; whether prosecutorial improprieties deprived defendant of his due process right to fair trial.*

Telman v. Hoyt, 194 CA 377 . . . . . 29A

*Fraud; hearing in damages; claim that trial court abused its discretion when it denied motion for additur as to attorney's fees; whether rules of practice provide for motion for additur in connection with hearing in damages to court.*

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Ferraro, 194 CA 467 . . . . . 119A

*Foreclosure; summary judgment; whether trial court improperly permitted and considered live testimony from witnesses during evidentiary hearing on motion for summary judgment as to liability and objection thereto; whether, by weighing credibility of witnesses who testified and assessing strength of evidence submitted at evidentiary hearing in deciding motion, trial court improperly decided genuine issue of material fact, which rendered granting of motion for summary judgment improper.*

Volume 194 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 125A

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Office of the Chief Public Defender—Applications FY 2020/21 Annual Agreements . . . . 1B

---