

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

---

VOL. LXXX No. 31                      January 29, 2019                      193 Pages

---

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Davis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 962 . . . . .	2
Pollard v. Geico General Ins. Co. (Order), 330 C 963. . . . .	3
State v. Mark T. (Order), 330 C 962. . . . .	2
Volume 330 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	5

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of America, N.A. v. Gonzalez, 187 CA 511. . . . .	75A
<i>Foreclosure; special defenses; whether trial court correctly concluded that named defendant could not prevail on his special defenses; whether trial court's finding that certain mortgage broker was not agent or employee of original mortgagee was clearly erroneous; whether named defendant satisfied his burden of proving that mortgage broker was agent or employee of original mortgagee.</i>	
Caron v. Connecticut Pathology Group, P.C., 187 CA 555 . . . . .	119A
<i>Medical malpractice; motion to dismiss; personal jurisdiction; whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction; whether trial court properly interpreted complaint as having alleged negligence by pathologists employed by defendant in their capacity as anatomic pathologists; whether trial court properly concluded that opinion letter authored by board certified clinical pathologist was legally insufficient pursuant to relevant statute (§ 52-190a [a]) because it was not authored by similar health care provider as that term is defined by statute (§ 52-184c [c]).</i>	
CitiMortgage, Inc. v. Pritchard (Memorandum Decision), 187 CA 901 . . . . .	155A
Coppedge v. Travis, 187 CA 528. . . . .	92A
<i>Personal injury; action pursuant to dog bite statute ([Rev. to 2013] § 22-357); claim that trial court improperly determined that § 22-357 applied to facts of case because dog's conduct was not vicious or mischievous; whether dog's conduct in charging toward plaintiff in exuberant manner fit within definition of mischievous behavior; whether trial court's finding on element of proximate cause was clearly erroneous.</i>	
Costello v. Goldstein & Peck, P.C., 187 CA 486 . . . . .	50A
<i>Legal malpractice; whether trial court properly granted motion to strike for improper joinder; whether plaintiffs' action concerned separate and distinct transactions that were independent of each other; whether plaintiffs were necessary and indispensable parties in each other's case; whether doctrines of collateral estoppel and res judicata barred subsequent litigation by plaintiff once that plaintiff was removed from case; whether trial court properly denied motion for costs pursuant to statute (§ 52-243).</i>	
Ledyard v. Perkins Properties, LLC (Memorandum Decision), 187 CA 901 . . . . .	155A
Maria G. v. Commissioner of Children & Families, 187 CA 466 . . . . .	30A
<i>Habeas corpus; petition for writ of habeas corpus to regain custody of minor child; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court erroneously failed to credit foreign court's decree; whether trial court properly concluded that foreign court's judgment was not required to be enforced as matter of comity; whether enforcement of foreign court's decree was contrary to this state's public policy of prevention of fraud; whether trial court correctly determined that any notice of foreign proceedings provided to respondent Commissioner of Children and Families was insufficient as matter of law.</i>	

(continued on next page)

People’s United Bank, National Assn. v. Purcell, 187 CA 523 . . . . . 87A  
*Personal jurisdiction; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to open judgment and to dismiss action; claim that trial court lacked personal jurisdiction over defendant because he had never been served with writ of summons and complaint; validity of service of process where defendant had different addresses.*

State v. Anderson, 187 CA 569. . . . . 133A  
*Motion to correct illegal sentence; motion to revise judgment mittimus; whether trial court properly denied in part and dismissed in part motion to correct illegal sentence; whether trial court properly dismissed motion to revise judgment mittimus; claim that defendant was entitled to jail time credit for same period of incarceration toward service of two separate sentences that did not run concurrent to each other; claim that defendant was entitled to presentence credit for all time incarcerated in lieu of bail or to revision of judgment mittimus to implement trial court’s order that he receive all pretrial credits to which he was entitled; whether trial court’s jurisdiction under applicable rule of practice (§ 43-22) applied to claim that concerned legality of sentence as calculated by Department of Correction and did not arise from sentencing proceeding.*

State v. Carey, 187 CA 438 . . . . . 2A  
*Murder; whether trial court erred in admitting certain testimony to explain victim’s fear of defendant and to rebut defendant’s claim of self-defense; claim that testimony was inadmissible hearsay; harmless error; whether state engaged in prosecutorial impropriety that deprived defendant of fair trial when, during direct examination of defendant, prosecutor stated that defense counsel was cheating; claim that prosecutor improperly impugned credibility of defense counsel; claim that prosecutor directed jury to disregard trial court’s charge as to affirmative defense of extreme emotional disturbance; whether prosecutor improperly argued facts not in evidence or expressed personal opinion regarding defendant’s credibility; whether trial court abused its discretion by giving jury falsus in uno instruction.*

State v. Jerrell R., 187 CA 537 . . . . . 101A  
*Risk of injury to child; unlawful restraint in second degree; double jeopardy; prosecutorial impropriety; claim that defendant’s conviction of two counts of risk of injury to child under different subdivisions of statute (§ 53-21 [a] [1] and [2]) violated constitutional prohibition against double jeopardy; whether defendant established that charged offenses arose out of same act or transaction; credibility of witnesses; claim that defendant was denied fair trial as result of prosecutorial improprieties; whether prosecutor misstated law with respect to subdivision (2) of § 53-21 (a) during closing argument by referring to evidence relating to risk of injury charge under § 53-21 (a) (1); failure of defendant to object to challenged remarks of prosecutor; whether prosecutor improperly offered personal opinion regarding credibility of witness; whether prosecutor’s use of phrase “in my opinion” raised concern of improper unsworn testimony.*

(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.

State *v.* Peluso, 187 CA 498 . . . . . 62A  
*Sexual assault in first degree; sexual assault in fourth degree; risk of injury to child; whether state lacked good cause to amend information during trial; whether trial court abused its discretion in permitting state to amend information to conform to victim’s testimony as to when offenses allegedly occurred; claim that trial court erred in concluding that defendant’s substantive rights were not prejudiced by state’s amendment to information during trial; whether trial court abused its discretion in deciding that one week continuance was sufficient time for defendant to augment his defense in response to amended information; whether defendant was prejudiced by amendment to information.*  
Volume 187 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 157A

**SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES**

Summaries . . . . . 1B

**NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES**

Social Services, Dept. of—Notice of Proposed Medicaid State Plan Amendment. . . . . 1C  
State Elections Enforcement Commission—Proposed Declaratory Ruling 2019-01. . . . . 2C  
State Elections Enforcement Commission—Resolution and Order . . . . . 9C

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Notices of Hearings for Reinstatement . . . . . 1D  
Notice of Resignation of Attorney. . . . . 1D

---