

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXII No. 3 July 21, 2020 254 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Hassiem v. O & G Industries, Inc. (Order), 335 C 928	42
Nonhuman Rights Project, Inc. v. R.W. Commerford & Sons, Inc. (Order), 335 C 929. . .	43
Reserve Realty, LLC v. BLT Reserve, LLC (see Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC), 335 C 174	2
Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC, 335 C 174	2
<i>Breach of contract; anticipatory breach; antitrust; claim that plaintiffs could not recover brokerage fees under certain real estate listing agreements because those agreements were list-back agreements that, defendants claimed, constituted per se illegal tying arrangements in violation of federal Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 1); certification from Appellate Court; claim that this court should overrule State v. Hossan-Maxwell, Inc. (181 Conn. 655), which held that list-back agreements committing purchaser of real property to use services of particular broker when leasing or reselling property are per se illegal, as no longer consistent with federal antitrust law; Hossan-Maxwell, Inc., to extent it held that real estate list-back agreements affecting not insubstantial volume of commerce are per se illegal, overruled; newly clarified standard governing antitrust challenges to list-back agreements, discussed.</i>	
State v. Milner (Order), 335 C 928.	42
State v. Taupier (Order), 335 C 928.	42
Volume 335 Cumulative Table of Cases	45

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Brown v. Brown, 199 CA 134	22A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court properly granted postjudgment motion for reimbursement of unallocated support; whether language of separation agreement that was incorporated into dissolution judgment was clear and unambiguous; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to modify child support when it concluded that reduction in earned income did not constitute substantial change in circumstances.</i>	
Carrico v. Mill Rock Leasing, LLC, 199 CA 252	140A
<i>Negligence; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly determined that counts against defendant alleged premises liability and not ordinary negligence; whether plaintiff alleged defendant owed duty because it owned or controlled premises or because that duty arose from snow services agreement it had with third-party land possessor.</i>	
500 North Avenue, LLC v. Planning Commission, 199 CA 115.	3A
<i>Zoning appeal; whether Superior Court improperly concluded that there was substantial evidence in record to support planning commission's finding that plaintiff's proposed lot line adjustment of two adjacent lots constituted subdivision under statute (§ 8-18); claim that Superior Court improperly concluded that subdivision approval was required because proposed lot line revision was more than minor adjustment; claim that because plaintiff's proposed boundary line revision would create third part, it required subdivision approval.</i>	
Labissoniere v. Gaylord Hospital, Inc., 199 CA 265	153A
<i>Medical malpractice; motion to dismiss; personal jurisdiction; subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over defendant that was not legal entity when patient was treated; whether opinion letter authored by</i>	

(continued on next page)

	<i>physician and general surgeon was by “similar health care provider” as defined by statute (§ 52-184c) when defendant physicians were board certified in internal medicine.</i>	
Norwalk Medical Group, P.C. v. Yee, 199 CA 208		96A
	<i>Arbitration; application to vacate arbitration award; application to confirm arbitration award; claim that arbitration award was not mutual, final and definite due to failure of arbitrator to allocate arbitration costs, expenses and compensation and to set forth reasoned award with respect to attorney’s fees.</i>	
State v. Coleman, 199 CA 172		60A
	<i>Assault in first degree; robbery in first degree; criminal possession of firearm; whether state’s three year delay in filing charges violated defendant’s right to due process; claim that right to speedy trial under sixth amendment and right under Interstate Agreement on Detainers (§ 54-186 et seq.) to final disposition of case within 180 days from date on which defendant requested speedy disposition were violated; claim that three year delay caused defendant actual substantial prejudice and was unreasonable and unjustifiable; claim that state deliberately delayed arrest to gain tactical advantage; waiver of claims stemming from postarrest delay.</i>	
State v. Ingala, 199 CA 240		128A
	<i>Motion to suppress; whether trial court properly concluded that search was lawful under exigent circumstances exception to warrant requirement; whether trial court properly denied defendant’s motion to suppress.</i>	
State v. Mayo, 199 CA 166		54A
	<i>Breach of peace in second degree; whether evidence was sufficient to support defendant’s conviction.</i>	
State v. Sumler, 199 CA 187		75A
	<i>Murder; conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; carrying pistol without permit; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; motion in limine; motion to suppress; unpreserved claim that trial judge violated defendant’s constitutional right to due process by improperly failing to recuse himself from presiding over defendant’s trial because he previously had signed search and seizure and arrest warrants against defendant; whether defendant could prevail pursuant to State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233); whether trial judge’s failure to recuse himself constituted plain error; claim that trial court abused its discretion in admitting witness’ testimony identifying defendant in surveillance video; whether witness’ testimony constituted opinion on ultimate issue for jury; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress certain statements defendant made to police officer; whether police officer’s conversation with defendant constituted custodial interrogation for purposes of Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436).</i>	
Stephen S. v. Commissioner of Correction, 199 CA 230		118A
	<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in rendering judgment declining to issue writ of habeas corpus; whether habeas petition was wholly frivolous on its face within meaning of applicable rule of practice (§ 23-24 (a) (2)); claim that habeas petition raised claims not raised in petitioner’s two previous habeas petitions.</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.

Volume 199 Cumulative Table of Cases 171A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Paid Family & Medical Leave Insurance Authority—Notice of Intent to Adopt Procedures 1C
DSS—Notice of Proposed Medicaid SPA. 5C

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Court sessions 2020–2021. 1D
Judge Trial Referee Designees Arbitration Proceedings—Trial de Novo. 3D
Personnel Notice—State’s Attorney, Judicial District of Hartford. 4D
