

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 24 December 10, 2019 310 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Ayres v. Ayres (Orders), 334 C 903	107
Birch v. Commissioner of Correction, 334 C 37	39
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that state deprived petitioner of due process right to fair trial insofar as it failed to correct trial testimony of former director of state police forensic laboratory that red substance on towel found in victim's home after murder of which petitioner was convicted tested positive for blood when no such test had been conducted and when subsequent testing performed years after petitioner's criminal trial revealed that red substance was not in fact blood; certification to appeal; whether habeas court applied correct standard in determining whether petitioner was entitled to new trial; standard to be applied whenever state fails to correct testimony that it knows or should have known to be false; whether former director of state police forensic laboratory should have known that his testimony was incorrect; whether such testimony is imputed to prosecutor; claim that respondent, Commissioner of Correction, failed to establish beyond reasonable doubt that incorrect testimony was immaterial; strength of state's case against petitioner, discussed.</i>	
Birch v. State, 334 C 69	71
<i>Felony murder; petition for new trial based on claim of newly discovered DNA and other evidence; claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that newly discovered DNA evidence did not warrant new trial; whether this court's decision in Birch v. Commissioner of Correction (334 Conn. 37), which addressed petitioner's appeal from denial of habeas petition and in which court determined that petitioner was entitled to new trial, rendered present appeal moot.</i>	
Henning v. Commissioner of Correction, 334 C 1	3
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that state deprived petitioner of due process right to fair trial insofar as it failed to correct trial testimony of former director of state police forensic laboratory that red substance on towel found in victim's home after murder of which petitioner was convicted tested positive for blood when no such test had been conducted and when subsequent testing performed years after petitioner's criminal trial revealed that red substance was not in fact blood; certification to appeal; whether habeas court applied correct standard in determining whether petitioner was entitled to new trial; standard to be applied whenever state fails to correct testimony that it knows or should have known to be false; whether former director of state police forensic laboratory should have known that his testimony was incorrect; whether such testimony is imputed to prosecutor; claim that respondent, Commissioner of Correction, failed to establish beyond reasonable doubt that incorrect testimony was immaterial; strength of state's case against petitioner, discussed.</i>	
Henning v. State, 334 C 33	35
<i>Felony murder; petition for new trial based on claim of newly discovered DNA and other evidence; claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that newly discovered DNA evidence did not warrant new trial; whether this court's decision in Henning v. Commissioner of Correction (334 Conn. 1), which addressed petitioner's appeal from denial of habeas petition and in which court determined that petitioner was entitled to new trial, rendered present appeal moot.</i>	
Klein v. Quinnipiac University (Order), 334 C 903	107
Lazar v. Ganim, 334 C 73	75
<i>Elections; primaries; action brought by electors pursuant to statute (§ 9-329a) to challenge, inter alia, improprieties in handling of absentee ballots during primary</i>	

(continued on next page)

election and seeking order directing new primary election; expedited appeal pursuant to statute (§ 9-325); whether appeal challenging results of primary and seeking new primary election was moot when general election has already occurred; whether trial court correctly determined that plaintiffs lacked standing to bring claims pursuant to § 9-329a (a) (1); whether trial court applied proper standard in determining whether plaintiff was entitled to new primary election.

Reale v. Rhode Island (Order), 334 C 901	105
State v. Alexis (Order), 334 C 904.	108
State v. Cane (Order), 334 C 901	105
State v. Crewe (Order), 334 C 901.	105
State v. Gomes (Order), 334 C 902	106
State v. Sentementes (Order), 334 C 902	106
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Magana (Order), 334 C 904	108
Volume 334 Cumulative Table of Cases	109

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of America, N.A. v. Bromfield (Memorandum Decision), 194 CA 904	82A
Dombrowski v. New Haven, 194 CA 739	51A
<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board erred in affirming Workers' Compensation Commissioner's denial of motion to open parties' stipulation that settled plaintiff's workers' compensation claims; whether board and commissioner correctly concluded that Workers' Compensation Commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction to entertain issues related to settlement agreement between parties; whether issues as to waiver of any rights plaintiff may have had were beyond commission's jurisdiction, which is limited to claims arising out of Workers' Compensation Act (§ 31-275 et seq.); reviewability of claims not presented to commissioner.</i>	
Haywood v. Commissioner of Correction, 194 CA 757	69A
<i>Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; claim that although prior appellate counsel, in petition for certification to appeal to our Supreme Court, claimed that it was improper for this court in petitioner's direct appeal to order that trial court modify petitioner's conviction of robbery in first degree as accessory to conviction of accessory to attempt to commit robbery in first degree, he improperly failed to include citation to State v. Sanseverino (287 Conn. 608) (Sanseverino I); claim that prior appellate counsel was ineffective in failing, while petition for certification in direct appeal was pending in our Supreme Court, to file motion for reconsideration in this court regarding modification issue after our Supreme Court officially released its decision in Sanseverino I; claim that prior habeas counsel was deficient in petitioner's first habeas trial because he failed to point out sufficiently errors of prior appellate counsel and because he failed to advance legal analyses set forth in concurring opinion by Chief Justice Rogers in State v. Sanseverino (291 Conn. 574) (Sanseverino II), which questioned wisdom of allowing modification of defendant's conviction to lesser included offense, where jury instruction on lesser</i>	

(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.

included offense was not provided by trial court, in future cases that do not share unique circumstances of that case; claim that prior appellate counsel was ineffective for failing to make argument against modification of petitioner's judgment based on his acquittal due to insufficient evidence and lack of jury instruction on lesser included offense, similar to way in which appellate attorney had successfully raised similar claim in State v. LaFleur (307 Conn. 115); whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether petitioner established that he was prejudiced by his claim that prior habeas counsel was ineffective in failing to claim that prior appellate counsel should have filed motion for reconsideration with this court in petitioner's direct appeal; claim that prior habeas counsel was ineffective in failing to address relevance of Sanseverino I, Sanseverino II, and LaFleur cases; whether petitioner could establish prejudice with respect to his claim that prior habeas counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to claim that prior appellate counsel was ineffective on direct appeal when he did not rely on Sanseverino I in his petition for certification to appeal to our Supreme Court; whether there was reasonable probability that, if appellate counsel had cited to Sanseverino I in his petition for certification to appeal to our Supreme Court, certification would have been granted and outcome of appeal would have been different.

M. B. v. S. A. (AC 42149), 194 CA 721 33A

Application for relief from abuse; claim that trial court improperly failed to consider evidence presented at hearing in making findings; whether trial court abused its discretion in issuing sanctions against plaintiff for filing frivolous application for relief from abuse.

M. B. v. S. A. (AC 42237), 194 CA 727 39A

Child custody; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting defendant's postjudgment motions for contempt against plaintiff during pendency of appeal; whether trial court abused its discretion in scheduling and adjudicating postjudgment motions for contempt before resolving motion for modification of visitation; whether trial court abused its discretion in finding plaintiff to be in contempt for failing to make support payments; claim that trial court erred in not considering plaintiff's financial affidavits in ruling on motions for contempt; whether vacation of arrearage amounts pursuant to Appellate Court's decision in separate appeal triggered retroactive vacation of underlying contempt orders or related sanctions; whether trial court abused its discretion by accepting financial affidavits filed by defendant under incorrect docket numbers.

R.D. Clark & Sons, Inc. v. Clark, 194 CA 690 2A

Breach of fiduciary duty; dissolution of corporation; action to determine fair value of stock; attorney's fees; claim that trial court erred in not tax affecting plaintiff corporation's earnings; whether trial court erred in declining to apply minority discount to value of minority shareholder's shares of corporation; whether trial court erred in awarding attorney's fees and expert witness fees; whether trial court properly found that defendant suffered minority oppression at hands of majority shareholders of corporation; claim that trial court erred in declining to apply marketability discount to value of defendant's shares in corporation; whether trial court properly accounted for loan due to corporation from defendant and ordered that certain sums be paid to defendant within thirty days of date of judgment; whether trial court abused its discretion by declining to award attorney's fees in accordance with contingency fee agreement defendant signed with counsel.

State v. Ortega (Memorandum Decision), 194 CA 904 82A

Volume 194 Cumulative Table of Cases 83A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Notice of Certificate—Affordable Housing Completion 1C

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Adoption of Revision to the Probate Court Rules of Procedure. 1D