

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

---

VOL. LXXX No. 32                      February 5, 2019                      232 Pages

---

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

BAC Home Loans Servicing, L.P. v. Lee (Orders), 330 C 967 . . . . .	7
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Fritzell (Order), 330 C 963 . . . . .	3
In re Amanda L. (Orders), 330 C 966 . . . . .	6
McQueeney v. Penny (Order), 330 C 966 . . . . .	6
State v. Armadore (Order), 330 C 965 . . . . .	5
State v. Davis (Order), 330 C 965 . . . . .	5
State v. Marsala (Order), 330 C 964 . . . . .	4
State v. Spring (Order), 330 C 963 . . . . .	3
Volume 330 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	9

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of America, National Assn. v. Liebskind (Memorandum Decision), 187 CA 902 . . .	194A
Bucknor v. Golden Hawk, LLC (Memorandum Decision), 187 CA 902 . . . . .	194A
Daley v. J.B. Hunt Transport, Inc., 187 CA 587 . . . . .	3A
<i>Wrongful termination of employment; whether trial court improperly denied motion seeking new trial or, alternatively, evidentiary hearing regarding competency of juror; whether, under unique circumstances of case, trial court erred in failing to hold postverdict evidentiary hearing to examine juror's competency during trial; whether there must be preliminary showing of strong evidence that juror likely was incompetent during his or her jury service before trial court is required to conduct full postverdict inquiry into juror's competency; whether there was sufficient evidence indicating that juror likely was not competent to serve on jury such that full inquiry by court into juror's competency was necessary.</i>	
Mosby v. Board of Education, 187 CA 771 . . . . .	187A
<i>Discrimination; service of process; motion to dismiss; release of jurisdiction; whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss action as untimely; whether plaintiff timely commenced action within ninety days of receiving release of jurisdiction from Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, as required by statute (§ 46a-101 [e]); whether action is commenced by service of process; whether action was untimely where defendant was served after expiration of statute of limitations; whether action could be saved by application of remedial savings statute (§ 52-593a).</i>	
State v. Berrios, 187 CA 661 . . . . .	77A
<i>Manslaughter in first degree; tampering with witness; intimidating witness; evasion of responsibility in operation of motor vehicle; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of tampering with witness and intimidating witness; claim that state failed to prove that defendant intended to prevent witness from testifying or to induce witness to testify falsely; whether trial court abused its discretion when it permitted medical examiner to testify as to manner of victim's death, which involved ultimate issue in case; claim that medical examiner's conclusion as to manner of victim's death was improperly based on information from police investigation; whether trial court improperly admitted prior misconduct evidence; claim that trial court abused its discretion in determining that certain testimony was admissible as uncharged misconduct evidence or pursuant to opening door doctrine; claim that trial court abused its discretion in determining that probative value of testimony as to prior misconduct outweighed its prejudicial impact; whether trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence crude text</i>	

(continued on next page)

messages defendant sent to witness; whether trial court properly determined that probative value of text messages outweighed prejudicial effect of defendant's crude language; claim that trial court improperly instructed jury on initial aggressor and provocation exceptions to defense of self-defense; whether jury reasonably could have concluded that defendant was initial aggressor and, thus, not justified in using any physical force; whether evidence was adequate to warrant trial court's jury instruction on provocation exception to defense of self-defense; whether trial court improperly included objective standard in its jury instruction on retreat exception to use of deadly physical force; harmless error; whether jury reasonably could have been misled by trial court's failure to properly convey subjective standard of duty to retreat.

State v. Bumgarner-Ramos, 187 CA 725 . . . . . 141A

Assault in first degree; aggravated sexual assault of minor; risk of injury to child; manslaughter in first degree; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support defendant's conviction of aggravated sexual assault of minor; whether state proved that defendant engaged in sexual intercourse with minor victim; whether there was evidence defendant penetrated victim's vaginal opening; whether trial court's finding that victim's injuries were inflicted by application of physical force on subject areas of victim's body by defendant was sufficient to support conviction of aggravated sexual assault of minor; claim that conviction of both assault in first degree and manslaughter in first degree as charged violated defendant's constitutional guarantee against double jeopardy; whether assault charge was lesser included offense of manslaughter charge; whether defendant could have caused death of victim in manner described in operative information without first having caused serious physical injury to victim; whether error was harmless.

State v. Jones, 187 CA 752 . . . . . 168A

Murder; carrying pistol without permit; criminal possession of firearm; whether trial court properly declined to give special credibility instruction regarding jailhouse informants as to testimony of witness; whether jailhouse informant exception applied; claim that trial court erred with respect to its jury instruction on eyewitness identification; claim that jury was misled by court's instructions; whether trial court properly tailored instructions to adapt to issues of case.

Wethersfield v. PR Arrow, LLC, 187 CA 604 . . . . . 20A

Zoning; whether trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction as to issue of whether parking and storage of commercial vehicles on defendant's property constituted valid accessory use within zoning regulations; whether claim that plaintiff zoning enforcement officer lacked standing to bring action on behalf of himself or plaintiff town was moot; claim that trial court improperly retained jurisdiction as to accessory use issue; whether trial court properly determined that defendant failed to exhaust administrative remedies as to special defense that zoning enforcement officer exceeded authority in issuing cease and desist order to defendant; claim that zoning regulations vested exclusive authority in town Planning and Zoning Commission to interpret words in zoning regulations that were undefined; claim that appeal to Zoning Board of Appeals would have been futile; claim that zoning

(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.

*regulation (§ 5.2.H.5) was impermissibly vague; whether § 5.2.H.5 provided adequate notice to defendant of standards utilized to evaluate special permit request for parking and storage of commercial vehicles; claim that trial court improperly interpreted term trucking operations in zoning regulations; claim that trial court substituted its interpretation of term trucking operations in zoning regulations for that of commission; whether trial court improperly exercised discretion in fashioning permanent injunctive relief in favor of plaintiffs; claim that trial court's injunction lacked sufficient clarity and definiteness; claim that trial court abused its discretion by imposing daily fine against defendant pursuant to statute (§ 8-12); claim that plaintiffs failed to prove that storage of commercial vehicles on defendant's property was public nuisance; claim that trial court abused its discretion in awarding costs and attorney's fees to plaintiffs pursuant to § 8-12; claim that trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiffs' postjudgment motion for contempt; claim that postjudgment motion for contempt was filed prematurely; claim that trial court improperly granted postjudgment motion for contempt; whether defendant waived objection to allegedly improper service of process of contempt motion by submitting to jurisdiction of court; whether defendant's noncompliance with trial court's order was wilful.*

Volume 187 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 195A

**SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES**

Summaries . . . . . 1B

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Notices of Suspension of Attorney . . . . . 1C, 2C  
 Notice of Reprimand of Attorney . . . . . 2C