

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 23 December 3, 2019 151 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Echeverria v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 333 C 947	35
Fernandez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 333 C 946	34
LaBarge v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 333 C 948.	36
Osborn v. Waterbury, 333 C 816.	2
<i>Negligence; public school playground supervision; expert testimony; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly determined that expert testimony was necessary to establish standard of care owed to student injured on playground as result of allegedly inadequate supervision by school personnel; whether determination of adequate supervision of children on school playground involves professional judgment or skill or is within common knowledge of layperson.</i>	
State v. Coltherst (Order), 333 C 946	34
State v. Fox (Order), 333 C 946	34
Stiggle v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 333 C 947.	35
Volume 333 Cumulative Table of Cases	37

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

H. F. v. M. M. (Memorandum Decision), 194 CA 904	96A
In re Cameron W., 194 CA 633.	37A
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court properly found that respondent mother was unable or unwilling to benefit from reunification efforts; whether trial court properly limited its analysis of whether mother was unable or unwilling to benefit from reunification efforts to events preceding adjudication date; whether trial court's finding that mother was unwilling to benefit from reunification efforts was supported by clear and convincing evidence; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly found that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify mother with her child.</i>	
State v. Joseph, 194 CA 684	88A
<i>Assault of public safety personnel; claim that jury's rejection of affirmative defense of mental disease or defect was not supported by evidence; whether jury was obligated to accept testimony of expert witness; credibility of witnesses.</i>	
State v. Michael T., 194 CA 598	2A
<i>Risk of injury to child; unlawful restraint in first degree; assault in first degree; criminal attempt to commit assault in first degree; assault in second degree; whether trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence forensic interviews of victims; claims that forensic interviews did not meet requirements of medical diagnosis and treatment exception to rule against hearsay, as established in State v. Griswold (160 Conn. App. 528), were irrelevant, were more prejudicial than probative and were cumulative; claim that trial court improperly denied motions for judgment of acquittal with respect to two counts of risk of injury to child because neither victim was placed at risk of injury to her physical or mental health, as neither victim actually witnessed burning of other; claim that trial court made constitutional and evidentiary error when it improperly precluded defendant from presenting evidence of third-party culpability by not allowing him to testify about his girlfriend's prior statement to him that she had burned victims; claim that trial court improperly determined that statement against penal interest exception</i>	

(continued on next page)

to rule against hearsay did not apply to alleged admission of defendant’s girlfriend to defendant that she had burned victims.

State v. Salters, 194 CA 670 74A
Assault of employee of Department of Correction; motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court abused its discretion when it denied motion to correct illegal sentence because sentencing court substantially relied on state’s materially inaccurate information at sentencing; whether defendant could establish that sentencing court relied on inaccurate information; whether police detective’s sworn testimony exceeded minimum indicia of reliability required of information relied on by court in sentencing; whether trial court discussed and applied correctly appropriate standard of actual reliance; whether there was anything in record that indicated that sentencing court relied on information regarding defendant’s activities in North Carolina to fashion defendant’s sentence; whether, because defendant failed to establish that sentencing court relied on inaccurate or unreliable information, other claims on appeal necessarily failed.

Stevens v. Khalily, 194 CA 626. 30A
Intentional infliction of emotional distress; whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly relied on affidavits of nonresident defendants and that affidavits were insufficient to rebut presumption of proper service; whether plaintiff failed to sustain his burden that he properly served nonresident defendants at their respective last known addresses and that he made a reasonably diligent search to find out their last known addresses, within a reasonable time, before attempting service of process.

Volume 194 Cumulative Table of Cases 97A

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel 1B

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.