

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

---

VOL. LXXXI No. 29                      January 14, 2020                      258 Pages

---

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Alpha Beta Capital Partners, L.P. v. Pursuit Investment Management, LLC (Orders), 334 C 911 . . . . .	61
Asselin & Viececi Partnership, LLC v. Washburn (Order), 334 C 913 . . . . .	63
In re Anthony L. (Order), 334 C 914 . . . . .	64
In re F.H. (Order), 334 C 914 . . . . .	64
Jenzack Partners, LLC v. Stoneridge Associates, LLC, 334 C 374 . . . . .	36
<i>Foreclosure; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that entity that had been assigned promissory note and mortgage that was granted as collateral to secure personal guarantee of that note had standing to foreclose mortgage even though guarantee was not explicitly assigned to foreclosing party; whether Appellate Court incorrectly determined that initial entry in plaintiff's record of debt, provided by entity that sold note to plaintiff, was inadmissible under statutory (§ 52-180) business records exception to hearsay rule.</i>	
Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel v. Savitt (Order), 334 C 914. . . . .	64
Puff v. Puff, 334 C 341 . . . . .	3
<i>Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motion for modification of alimony; motion for contempt and for sanctions; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly reversed trial court's contempt order; civil contempt, discussed; whether trial court failed to make specific findings that plaintiff acted in bad faith and did not advance colorable claims in support of its award of, inter alia, attorney's fees to defendant for plaintiff's purported litigation misconduct; remand for further proceedings on defendant's motion for sanctions.</i>	
Robbins Eye Center, P.C. v. Commerce Park Associates, LLC (Orders), 334 C 912 . . . .	62
Robert S. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 334 C 913 . . . . .	63
State v. Salters (Order), 334 C 913 . . . . .	63
State v. Ward (Order), 334 C 911 . . . . .	61
Volume 334 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	65

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Barnes v. Connecticut Podiatry Group, P.C., 195 CA 212 . . . . .	36A
<i>Medical malpractice; motion to preclude expert testimony; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in precluding plaintiff from disclosing additional expert witnesses; claim that trial court erred in adhering to prior order precluding disclosure of additional expert witnesses; whether trial court erred in precluding expert opinions of plaintiff's disclosed expert as to standard of care and causation; whether trial court erred in rendering summary judgment in favor of defendants.</i>	
HSBC Bank USA, National Assn. v. Nathan, 195 CA 179. . . . .	3A
<i>Foreclosure; special defenses; counterclaims; whether trial court properly granted motion to strike; whether defendants preserved right to appeal nonrepleaded counts of counterclaim; whether defendants preserved right to appeal certain special defense that they specifically had described as abandoned; claim that trial court erred in striking certain nonrepleaded counts of counterclaim, second amended laches defense and second amended counterclaim on the ground that they did not satisfy making, validity or enforcement test; whether allegations of postorigination misconduct by plaintiff satisfied making, validity or enforcement test.</i>	

(continued on next page)

State v. Brown, 195 CA 244 . . . . . 68A  
*Breach of peace in second degree; criminal violation of protective order; assault in third degree; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for joinder of cases; claim that trial court improperly allowed jury to consider prejudicial evidence of two different crimes; claim that trial court improperly allowed state to use prejudicial language during voir dire questioning; whether joinder resulted in substantial prejudice to defendant; whether two incidents leading to charges against defendant were discrete and easily distinguishable; whether assaults were so brutal or shocking as to interfere with jury's ability to consider each offense fairly and objectively; unpreserved claim that defendant's federal right to fair trial was violated when trial court allowed state to use prejudicial language during state's voir dire questioning of potential jurors; whether trial court improperly allowed facts of case to be introduced in effort to remedy use of prejudicial language; whether introduction of phrases by state, such as "domestic violence," "family violence," and "dispute between roommates" during voir dire was improper; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's request for continuance at start of trial to accommodate presence of witness.*

State v. Jarmon, 195 CA 262 . . . . . 86A  
*Home invasion; burglary in first degree; robbery in first degree; stealing firearm; claim that state presented insufficient evidence to prove beyond reasonable doubt operability of each stolen firearm; whether cumulative effect of evidence supported jury's ultimate conclusion that state demonstrated operability beyond reasonable doubt; claim that trial court erroneously admitted into evidence defendant's letter written while incarcerated, which was intercepted by correction officer and forwarded to law enforcement; whether defendant's claim that trial court erred in determining that correction officer followed department regulation was ever distinctly raised at trial; whether defendant proved that he had objectively reasonable expectation of privacy such that fourth amendment rights were violated; whether department regulation at issue was void for vagueness as applied to defendant; claim that defendant's conviction of home invasion and burglary violated constitutional protection against double jeopardy; whether defendant showed that two charges arose out of same act or transaction; whether evidence allowed defendant's crimes to be separated into parts, each of which constituted completed offense.*

State v. Mitchell, 195 CA 199. . . . . 23A  
*Motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that sentence was imposed in illegal manner in violation of Santobello v. New York because defendant was sentenced after nine month period of Garvin agreement had ended; claim that sentence was imposed in illegal manner because defendant was not given adequate notice of sentencing hearing; claim that defendant was denied opportunity to make statement or to present evidence at sentencing hearing; claim that imposition of sentence violated applicable rule of practice (§ 43-29); whether trial court properly determined that defendant confused notice for violation hearing with notice for sentencing hearing.*

Streifel v. Bulkley, 195 CA 294. . . . . 118A  
*Negligence; duty of care; summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of defendant; whether plaintiff waived any*

(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.

*claim that trial court improperly failed to treat motion for summary judgment, which effectively challenged legal sufficiency of complaint, as motion to strike; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment because question of whether defendant owed plaintiff duty of care involved question of fact reserved for jury; whether determination of whether duty of care existed under circumstances of this case was question of law; whether trial court was permitted to decide that no duty existed solely on public policy grounds; claim that applying test articulated in Murillo v. Seymour Ambulance Assn., Inc. (264 Conn. 474) to determine whether recognizing duty of care is inconsistent with public policy conflicts with state's abolition of doctrine of assumption of risk as complete bar to recovery; whether plaintiff's reliance on Sepega v. DeLaura (326 Conn. 788) to support claim was misplaced; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that imposing duty of care on defendant while plaintiff was furnishing medical care to him was inconsistent with public policy; whether this court should recognize, as matter of law, that patient owes duty of care to avoid negligent conduct that causes harm to medical care provider while patient is receiving medical care from that provider; whether application of relevant public policy considerations articulated in test in Murillo weighed against recognizing duty of care.*

Volume 195 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 159A

**NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES**

DSS—Extension of Specified Public Comment Deadlines . . . . . 1B

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Notice of Amendment—Connecticut Bar Examining Committee Regulations. . . . . 1C  
 Notice of Application for Reinstatement to the Bar . . . . . 22C  
 Personnel Notice—State's Attorney Fairfield JD . . . . . 22C