

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXII No. 2 July 14, 2020 340 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Factor King, LLC v. Housing Authority (Order), 335 C 927	43
Goguen v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 335 C 925	41
Jepsen v. Camassar (Order), 335 C 926.	42
Johnson v. Preleski, 335 C 138.	2
<i>Petition for new trial based on newly discovered evidence; certification from Appellate Court; claim that petition was time barred because it was served on respondent state's attorney one day after expiration of applicable limitation period; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that savings statute (§ 52-593a (a)), which requires that process be personally delivered to marshal within applicable limitation period, did not save untimely petition when process was sent by facsimile to marshal on final day of limitation period but there was no evidence as to when marshal came into physical possession of process; whether process is personally delivered to marshal within meaning of § 52-593a (a) when sender transmits it by facsimile; whether there was sufficient evidence to establish that process was personally delivered to marshal within applicable limitation period.</i>	
Rojas v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 335 C 925	41
State v. Bradbury (Order), 335 C 925	41
State v. Fortin (Order), 335 C 926.	42
State v. Tinsley (Order), 335 C 927	43
Volume 335 Cumulative Table of Cases	45

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of New York Mellon v. Francois, 198 CA 885.	33A
<i>Foreclosure; vacated judgment; appellate stay; claim that appellate stay of execution arising from judgment of foreclosure and initial appeal was violated when trial court vacated first judgment and rendered second judgment of foreclosure.</i>	
Castro v. Bajana (Memorandum Decision), 198 CA 901	47A
Dominguez v. New York Sports Club, 198 CA 854	2A
<i>Workers' compensation; appeal from decision of Compensation Review Board precluding defendant employer and its workers' compensation insurer from contesting compensability of claim for work-related injuries; whether board improperly precluded defendants from contesting extent of plaintiff's injuries; claim that plaintiff's failure to submit medical bills or request for payment to defendants within twenty-eight days of notice of claim rendered it impossible for defendants to comply with statutory (§ 31-294c (b)) predicate to commence payment; extension of limited exception to preclusion provision of § 31-294c (b) articulated in Dubrosky v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp. (145 Conn. App. 261), rejected.</i>	
Mislick v. Commission of Motor Vehicles (Memorandum Decision), 198 CA 901.	47A
Salerno v. Lowe's Home Improvement Center, 198 CA 901	27A
<i>Workers' compensation; appeal from decision of Compensation Review Board precluding defendant employer and its workers' compensation insurer from contesting compensability of claim for work-related injuries; claim that plaintiff's failure to submit medical bills or request for payment to defendants within twenty-eight days of notice of claim rendered it impossible for defendants to avail themselves of statutory (§ 31-294c (b)) one year safe harbor provision; extension of</i>	

(continued on next page)

<i>limited exception to preclusion provision of § 31-294c (b) articulated in Dubrosky v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp. (145 Conn. App. 261), rejected.</i>	
Y. L. v. G. C. (Memorandum Decision), 198 CA 901	47A
Volume 198 Cumulative Table of Cases	49A
Amity Partners v. Woodbridge Associates, L.P., 199 CA 1	57A
<i>Contracts; summary judgment; best evidence rule; claim that trial court improperly determined that best evidence rule barred plaintiff's reliance on certain deposition testimony in support of its opposition to motion for summary judgment; whether plaintiff failed to satisfy its burden, pursuant to applicable rule (§ 10-3) of Connecticut Code of Evidence, to prove that deposition testimony was sufficient to establish former existence, present unavailability and contents of certain document.</i>	
D. S. v. R. S., 199 CA 11	67A
<i>Application for relief from abuse; domestic violence restraining order; whether trial court erred in issuing domestic violence restraining order pursuant to statutory (§ 53a-181d) definition of stalking rather than definition of stalking in Princess Q. H. v. Robert H. (150 Conn. App. 105); reviewability of claim that trial court erroneously relied on testimony that plaintiff gave on behalf of minor child; harmlessness of trial court's ruling.</i>	
Flood v. Flood, 199 CA 67	123A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motions for modification of child support; whether trial court's finding that there had been substantial change in defendant's financial circumstances was clearly erroneous; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining amount of defendant's child support obligation; claim that trial court erred by failing to consider and rule on defendant's motion for modification of child support obligation.</i>	
Godbout v. Attanasio, 199 CA 88	144A
<i>Official misconduct pursuant to statute (§ 12-170); motor vehicle tax assessment; claim that trial court improperly granted motion to dismiss on ground that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction because plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies; claim that motion to dismiss was improper procedural vehicle to challenge legal sufficiency of complaint; claim that trial court improperly determined that the complaint was insufficiently pleaded.</i>	
Mendes v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act, 199 CA 25	81A
<i>Unemployment compensation; appeal from decision of Board of Review of Employment Security Appeals Division affirming decision finding plaintiff ineligible for certain unemployment benefits; motion to open; claim that trial court exceeded scope of its authority by assessing factual findings of appeals referee as adopted by board; whether plaintiff was required to file motion to correct board's factual findings pursuant to rule of practice (§ 22-4).</i>	
State v. Lopez, 199 CA 56	112A
<i>Attempt to commit robbery in first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; claim that trial court improperly admitted uncharged misconduct evidence; harmless error.</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.

State *v.* Romero, 199 CA 39 95A
Violation of probation; claim that trial court improperly declined to apply exclusionary rule pursuant to article first, § 7, of Connecticut constitution; whether warrantless search violated Connecticut constitution under certain condition of defendant's probation; whether defendant could reasonably be subjected to search of residence and possessions when probation officer had reasonable suspicion that defendant was violating conditions of probation.
Volume 199 Cumulative Table of Cases 173A

CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK

Practice Book Amendments, Rules of Professional Conduct and Superior Court Rules Adopted 1PB
Practice Book Rules Adopted, Amended or Suspended Under Practice Book Section 1-9B in Light of the Declared Public Health and Civil Preparedness Emergencies. 75PB

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Court Sessions 2020—2021 1B
