CONNECTICUT

LAW

JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXII No. 9

September 1, 2020

129 Pages

Table of Contents

Action to recover on promissory note; foreclosure; standing; subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiff lacked standing to enforce note and to foreclose on mortgage; whether plaintiff, who never possessed original note, was entitled to enforce note as successor to defendant's former husband pursuant to order of attachment and garnishment of note issued by trial court in plaintiff's prior action against him; whether statute (§ 42a-3-309) that governs enforcement of lost, destroyed or stolen instruments was directly applicable to situation underlying present case; whether plaintiff's possession of copy of note was sufficient to confer standing on her to enforce note; whether plaintiff could meet requirements of § 42a-3-309; whether plaintiff produced necessary and proper secondary evidence to create genuine issue of material fact that she was owner of debt underlying mortgage; whether plaintiff had standing to foreclose on mortgage pursuant to statute (§ 52-329) or trial court's common-law powers of equity.	
Jeweler v. Wilton, 199 CA 842	110
Declaratory judgment; whether proposed boundary line adjustments with respect to certain real property required subdivision approval; whether trial court properly concluded that boundary line adjustments did not constitute subdivision pursuant to statute (§ 8-18); whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiffs' proposed boundary line adjustments constituted resubdivision under § 8-18.	
Josephine Towers, L.P. v. Kelly, 199 CA 829	97
Summary process; motion to open judgment; motion to dismiss; claim that plaintiffs served insufficient notice to quit; whether trial court had subject matter jurisdiction to render judgment on ground of nuisance; claim that notice to quit did not adhere to statutory (§ 47a-23) requirements; whether trial court properly denied motions to dismiss and to open judgment.	
D ** NTIL 11 100 CL F01	29
Parisi v. Niblett, 199 CA 761	20
tasues. State v. Errol J., 199 CA 800	68
Risk of injury to child; cruelty to persons; claim that trial court erred by restricting defendant's cross-examination of state's expert witnesses, thereby violating his constitutional right to confrontation; whether trial court abused its discretion in sustaining prosecutor's objections to defense counsel's line of questioning with respect to certain expert witness; whether trial court properly admitted unredacted medical records and related testimony under medical diagnosis or treatment exception to hearsay rule; claim that several improper statements by prosecutor during closing argument violated defendant's constitutional right to fair trial; claim that trial court erred in failing to give jury instruction on statutory (§ 53a-18 (1)) parental justification defense with respect to situation prong of risk of injury to child charge; whether parental justification defense applied to situation prong of statute (§ 53-21 (a) (1)).	00
Volume 199 Cumulative Table of Cases	121

(continued on next page)

MISCELLANEOUS

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes \S 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, $Publications\ Director$

 $Published\ Weekly-Available\ at\ \underline{\text{https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal}}$

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.