

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

---

VOL. LXXXI No. 22                      November 26, 2019                      249 Pages

---

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Boccanfuso v. Daghoghi (Order), 333 C 943 . . . . .	91
Cenatiempo v. Bank of America, N.A., 333 C 769 . . . . .	41
<i>Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); common-law negligence; negligence per se; motion to strike; whether plaintiffs' allegations were sufficient to support CUTPA and common-law negligence claims that defendant's conduct as loan servicer violated clearly defined standards and policies reflected in federal and state statutory provisions aimed at preventing foreclosure, and consent order and national mortgage settlement to which defendant was party; claim that allegations in negligence count of complaint could be construed to extend to theory of negligence per se; federal and state response to national foreclosure crisis, including federal home loan modification program, discussed.</i>	
Cordero v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 333 C 944 . . . . .	92
Doan v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 333 C 944 . . . . .	92
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Virgulak (Order), 333 C 945 . . . . .	93
Olymbec Hartford, Ltd. Partnership v. Access Lending, LLC (Order), 333 C 944 . . . . .	92
State v. Battle (Order), 333 C 942 . . . . .	90
State v. Shin (Order), 333 C 943 . . . . .	91
State v. Small (Order), 333 C 945 . . . . .	93
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Crawford, 333 C 731 . . . . .	3
<i>Writ of error; foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly denied plaintiff in error's motion for committee fees and expenses from nondebtor on ground that automatic stay provision (11 U.S.C. § 362 [a]) of United States Bankruptcy Code applied to motion; whether writ of error from trial court's interlocutory order denying motion for fees and expenses was reviewable under second prong of test set forth in State v. Curcio (191 Conn. 27); whether writ of error was rendered moot by termination of automatic bankruptcy stay during pendency of writ of error; whether capable of repetition, yet evading review exception to mootness doctrine applied to writ of error; whether state courts have subject matter jurisdiction to extend automatic bankruptcy stay to proceedings against nondebtors; claim that this court should overrule Appellate Court's decision in Equity One, Inc. v. Shivers (150 Conn. App. 745).</i>	
Volume 333 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	95

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Asselin & Vieceli Partnership, LLC v. Washburn, 194 CA 519 . . . . .	49A
<i>Arbitration; whether trial court properly granted application to confirm arbitration award and denied demand for trial de novo; whether arbitration submission was restricted or unrestricted; failure to properly preserve claims for appellate review; whether defendant failed to demonstrate that arbitrator exceeded or imperfectly executed her powers in issuing award in violation of statute (§ 52-418 [a] [4]); claim that arbitrator exceeded her authority when she did not apply construction industry rules of American Arbitration Association when arbitrating parties' dispute; whether record supported claim that arbitrator exceeded her authority and manifestly disregarded law in failing to consider parties' obligations under construction contract.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Crawley v. Commissioner of Correction, 194 CA 574. . . . . 104A  
*Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly dismissed claims of ineffective assistance of trial counsel pursuant to successive petition doctrine codified in applicable rule of practice (§ 23-29 [3]); claim that habeas court improperly denied claim that prior habeas counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to raise claim that petitioner's criminal trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to file motion to suppress cocaine found in petitioner's bedroom; whether failure of trial counsel to file motion to suppress was objectively reasonable.*

Dubinsky v. Riccio, 194 CA 588 . . . . . 118A  
*Legal malpractice; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment; whether genuine issue of material fact existed as to claim that defendant failed to advise plaintiff of rights he was giving up by entering into separation agreement in prior dissolution of marriage action; adoption of trial court's decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.*

Lambeck v. Silver Hill Hospital, Inc. (Memorandum Decision), 194 CA 903. . . . . 131A

Saunders v. Commissioner of Correction, 194 CA 473 . . . . . 3A  
*Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly dismissed petition for writ of habeas corpus on grounds that due process claims were procedurally defaulted and petitioner failed to allege legally cognizable cause and prejudice to overcome procedural defaults; claim that petitioner's rights to due process were violated on ground that he was tried while he was incompetent and that competency examination had not been requested for him by trial court or state, in violation of statute (§ 54-56d), during criminal proceedings; assertion that due process claims were not subject to procedural default rule; reviewability of due process claims; assertion that claims of incompetence to stand trial should be treated in same manner as substantial claims of actual innocence, which are not subject to procedural default.*

Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Spear (Memorandum Decision), 194 CA 902 . . . . . 130A

Sempey v. Stamford Hospital, 194 CA 505 . . . . . 35A  
*Wrongful termination of employment; motion to strike; claim that trial court improperly struck each count of operative complaint; whether factual allegations contained in complaint for wrongful termination in breach of implied contract set forth facts essential to establishment of implied contract or specified public policy that was alleged to have been implicated by plaintiff's discharge from defendant's employ; whether there was anything in record that indicated that plaintiff sought permission of trial court or agreement of defendant to amend complaint by adding new cause of action after case was remanded to trial court by Appellate Court; whether statements made by representatives of defendant before Employment Security Division of Department of Labor when contesting plaintiff's eligibility for unemployment benefits were absolutely privileged; whether plaintiff's allegations that defendant improperly withheld three personal folders that contained various certificates and personal records were sufficient to establish claim for negligent infliction of emotional distress; whether plaintiff alleged any acts committed by defendant in conduct of any trade or commerce to support claim for violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practice Act (§ 42-110a et seq.).*

(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.

Stanley v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 194 CA 903 . . . . .	131A
State v. Ramos, 194 CA 594 . . . . .	124A
<i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; subject matter jurisdiction; whether motion to correct illegal sentence was proper procedural vehicle to raise claim challenging legality of defendant's conviction; whether trial court lacked jurisdiction over motion to correct illegal sentence that did not challenge legality of sentence imposed; improper form of judgment.</i>	
Sullivan v. Associated Ins. Agency, LLC (Memorandum Decision), 194 CA 902. . . . .	130A
T & M Building Co. v. Hastings, 194 CA 532. . . . .	62A
<i>Contracts; specific performance; statute of frauds; promissory estoppel; unjust enrichment; claim that trial court erred in determining that handwritten document executed by parties violated statute of frauds; claim that trial court should have considered extrinsic evidence and past performance; claim that trial court erred in rendering judgment for defendant on unjust enrichment claim; claim that court erred in rendering judgment for defendant on promissory estoppel claim.</i>	
Villar v. A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. (Memorandum Decision), 194 CA 903. . . . .	131A
Watts v. Commissioner of Correction, 194 CA 558 . . . . .	88A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly rejected claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to properly advise petitioner about plea offer; whether petitioner proved that he was prejudiced by counsel's alleged deficient performance; claim that ninety-five year sentence violated right to remain free from cruel and unusual punishment; claim that petitioner was entitled to new sentencing proceeding in which court must consider mitigating factors of youth and impose proportionate sentence; claim that Appellate Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction because petitioner was not aggrieved by habeas court's dismissal without prejudice of cruel and unusual punishment claims; whether petitioner was entitled to resentencing in light of legislation (P.A. 15-84) passed subsequent to petitioner's conviction that provided parole eligibility for juvenile offenders serving sentence of greater than ten years of incarceration, where Supreme Court determined in State v. Williams-Bey (333 Conn. 468), which had been pending during petitioner's habeas trial, that parole eligibility adequately remedied any violation of requirement that mitigating factors of youth be considered before sentence of life without possibility of parole, or functional equivalent thereof, could be imposed.</i>	
Volume 194 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	133A

### NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Notices of Proposed Medicaid SPA's . . . . .	1B
--	----

### MISCELLANEOUS

Office of the Chief Public Defender—Applications FY 2020/21 Annual Agreements . . . . .	1C
Notice of Reprimand of Attorney . . . . .	3C