

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 28

January 7, 2020

92 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

In re Tresin J., 334 C 314 . . . . .	2
<i>Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court improperly terminated respondent father's parental rights as to his minor child on statutory (§ 17a-112 [j] [3] [D]) ground that respondent had no ongoing parent-child relationship with child; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly upheld trial court's termination of respondent's parental rights; claim that virtual infancy exception to lack of ongoing parent-child relationship ground for termination applied when child was less than two years old at time that respondent was incarcerated but six years old at time of termination hearing; claim that interference exception to lack of ongoing parent-child relationship ground for termination applied because child's mother was unable to foster ongoing parent-child relationship between child and respondent during respondent's incarceration.</i>	
Volume 334 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	29

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

HSBC Bank USA, National Assn. v. Karlen, 195 CA 170 . . . . .	42A
<i>Foreclosure; summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to liability; whether plaintiff established undisputed prima facie case that it was entitled to foreclosure as matter of law; failure of plaintiff to provide trial court with copy or any evidence of terms of loan modification agreement that affected promissory note; whether defendants' failure to file objection to motion for summary judgment or to raise issue concerning absence of loan modification agreement via special defense or otherwise before trial court had effect on plaintiff's burden to establish prima facie case; whether plaintiff presented evidence that defendants defaulted on loan as modified by loan modification agreement.</i>	
Kolashuk v. Hatch, 195 CA 131 . . . . .	3A
<i>Writ of error; claim that this court lacked subject matter jurisdiction; claim that writ of error should be dismissed because it was not taken from final judgment; claim that sanctions and attorney's fees issued against plaintiff in error did not terminate distinct and separate proceeding because relevant orders were issued during discovery phase of underlying personal injury case, requested cell phone records were necessary to resolve defendant in error's case, and those records were inextricably intertwined with defendant in error's case; claim that interlocutory order requiring witness to submit to discovery is not final judgment and, therefore, is not immediately appealable; claim that imposition of sanctions and attorney's fees against plaintiff in error did not terminate distinct and separate proceeding because trial court did not find plaintiff in error to be in contempt; whether trial court erred as matter of law by ordering plaintiff in error to produce cell phone records that neither he nor his client, who was defendant in underlying action, owned or possessed, and by issuing sanctions against plaintiff in error and awarding attorney's fees to counsel for defendant in error.</i>	
State v. Mekoshvili, 195 CA 154 . . . . .	26A
<i>Murder; self-defense; claim that testimony regarding statements made by victim was irrelevant as to whether defendant killed victim or whether he acted with criminal intent; whether testimony demonstrated that defendant had financial motive in killing victim; claim that victim's statements to wife were self-serving</i>	

(continued on next page)

*and backward looking, and did not satisfy state of mind exception to hearsay rule; whether trial court improperly allowed, pursuant to habit exception of hearsay rule, testimony regarding victim's customary habit of leaving portion of taxi fee in glove compartment of taxi; whether testimony was relevant to issue of motive for defendant to kill victim; claim that state failed to provide adequate foundation for admission of testimony regarding habit evidence; whether trial court properly instructed jury with general unanimity charge and did not err in failing to grant defendant's request for specific unanimity charge as to claim of self-defense.*

Volume 195 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 53A

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel . . . . .	1B
Notice of Interim Suspension of Attorney . . . . .	2B
Notice of New Case Type—Abandoned and Blighted Property Receiverships . . . . .	2B
Notice of Suspension of Attorney . . . . .	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](http://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.