

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXII No. 14 October 6, 2020 199 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Davis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 335 C 948	6
Kammili v. Kammili (Order), 335 C 947	5
Maselli v. Regional School District Number 10 (Order), 335 C 947	5
Semac Electric Co. v. Skanska USA Building, Inc. (Orders), 335 C 945	3
Stanley v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 335 C 946	4
State v. Dyous (Order), 335 C 948	6
State v. Joseph V. (Order), 335 C 945	3
Summit Saugatuck, LLC v. Water Pollution Control Authority (Order), 335 C 944	2
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Melahn (Order), 335 C 947	5
Summit Saugatuck, LLC v. Water Pollution Control Authority (Order) (replacement pages), 334 C 915–16.	v
Volume 335 Cumulative Table of Cases	7

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Dempsey v. Cappuccino, 200 CA 653	101A
<i>Child custody; mootness; claim that trial court improperly permitted defendant to have unsupervised visits with minor child and failed to find that defendant had substance abuse issues; whether subsequent trial court order rendered appeal moot; whether plaintiff failed to adequately brief claim regarding order of joint custody.</i>	
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Pototschnig, 200 CA 554	2A
<i>Foreclosure; standing; whether trial court properly determined that plaintiff had standing to bring foreclosure action; claim that trial court failed to accord res judicata and collateral estoppel effect to New York court decision; claim that trial court erred in failing to consider whether trust for which plaintiff is trustee ever received note and mortgage; whether trial court abused its discretion in making certain evidentiary rulings.</i>	
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Shivers (Memorandum Decision), 200 CA 903	171A
Goody v. Bedard, 200 CA 621	69A
<i>Negligence; premises liability; motion for extension of time; summary judgment; claim that trial court abused its discretion in effectively denying plaintiff's third motion for extension of time to respond to defendant's motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment; whether trial court erred in determining that there was no disputed issue of material fact that defendant did not owe duty of care to decedent.</i>	
Jackson v. Yale University (Memorandum Decision), 200 CA 902	170A
Larmel v. Metro North Commuter Railroad Co., 200 CA 660	108A
<i>Negligence; accidental failure of suit statute (§ 52-592 (a)); motion to dismiss; arbitration (§ 52-549u et seq.); claim that trial court failed to hold that plaintiff's action was viable pursuant to § 52-592 (a); whether Nunno v. Wixner (257 Conn. 671) was controlling.</i>	
Lepeska v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 200 CA 903	171A
Marshall v. Marshall, 200 CA 688	136A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court acted within scope of this court's remand order when it used methodology of reasonable compensation to determine plaintiff's pre-tax income in context of effectuating parties' separation agreement; whether trial court erred when it used plaintiff's reasonable compensation to determine his alimony obligation; claim that this court's previous determination</i>	

(continued on next page)

<i>that alimony calculation was to be made using pre-tax income was law of case; whether trial court improperly considered plaintiff's argument, which he did not advance in prior proceedings, that alimony obligation should be based on his reasonable compensation; whether trial court's determination of plaintiff's pre-tax income on basis of his reasonable compensation was clearly erroneous; whether trial court improperly modified alimony retroactively for period of four years prior to plaintiff's motion to modify alimony.</i>	
Schuler v. Commissioner of Correction, 200 CA 602	50A
<i>Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal from judgment denying petition for writ of habeas corpus because certification to appeal form contained no specified grounds for appeal; claim that habeas court reasonably should have concluded that petitioner intended to appeal from denial of ineffective assistance of counsel claim; whether habeas court improperly denied claim of ineffective assistance of counsel.</i>	
Speer v. Skaats (Memorandum Decision), 200 CA 903	171A
State v. Byrne (Memorandum Decision), 200 CA 902.	170A
State v. Freddy T., 200 CA 577.	25A
<i>Risk of injury to child; sexual assault in first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence portions of video recording of social worker's forensic interview with child; claim that forensic interview did not meet requirements of medical diagnosis and treatment exception to rule against hearsay as set forth in provision of Code of Evidence (§ 8-3 (5)).</i>	
State v. Robert B., 200 CA 637.	85A
<i>Unlawful restraint in first degree; breach of peace in second degree; whether defendant's claim that his rights to due process and fair trial were violated when witness testified as to defendant's prior bad acts and arrests was preserved and of constitutional magnitude; claim that defendant was denied fair trial due to prosecutorial impropriety; whether defendant's unpreserved claim that trial court erred by failing to instruct jury on lesser included offense of unlawful restraint in second degree was waived.</i>	
Volume 200 Cumulative Table of Cases	173A
NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES	
Notice of Intent to Amend Connecticut Green Bank	1B

(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.

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Reprimand of Attorneys 1C
