

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 33 February 11, 2020 315 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Michael D. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 334 C 920	40
Wachovia Mortgage, FSB v. Toczek (Order), 334 C 921	41
Zhou v. Zhang, 334 C 601.	3
<i>Dissolution of marriage; postnuptial agreements; purported agreement to revoke prior postnuptial agreement during divorce mediation; whether trial court correctly concluded that parties' written agreement purporting to revoke their postnuptial agreement was unenforceable; whether party seeking to have court declare revocation agreement unenforceable understood that that agreement was binding only if parties reached full and final settlement of disputed issues during mediation; whether trial court properly considered parol evidence in evaluating defendant's claim that revocation agreement was not binding without final settlement of disputed issues during mediation; claim that trial court had incorrectly determined that parties' postnuptial agreement was enforceable because it was fair and equitable at time of execution and not unconscionable at time of dissolution; whether plaintiff's decision to enter into postnuptial agreement was voluntary and not product of duress; whether trial court abused its discretion when it granted defendant final decision-making authority with respect to parties' children; claim that trial court improperly based its custody orders on testimony of guardian ad litem on ground that she testified that she had not seen children in two years.</i>	
Volume 334 Cumulative Table of Cases	43

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Berka v. Middletown, 195 CA 760	220A
<i>Zoning; citation hearing procedures statute (§ 7-152c); appellate review statute (§ 8-8(o)); claim that city's blight ordinance violated plaintiff's due process rights; whether trial court erred in dismissing plaintiff's appeal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies; whether plaintiff failed to timely seek from this court certification for review of judgment of dismissal, pursuant to § 8-8 (o); whether trial court erred in granting motion to dismiss for lack of actual controversy; whether trial court failed to construe self-represented plaintiff's complaint in broad and realistic manner; whether trial court could afford practical relief to plaintiff if he ultimately proves that some or all of provisions of § 7-152c or blight ordinance at issue violated constitutional rights; whether trial court erred in granting defendant's motion to dismiss plaintiff's action as moot.</i>	
Cox v. Colon-Collazo (Memorandum Decision), 195 CA 906	242A
Ervin v. Commissioner of Correction, 195 CA 663	123A
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance of counsel to petitioner by failing to present expert testimony from independent forensic pathologist to refute testimony of state's chief medical examiner as to cause of victim's death; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance of counsel at petitioner's criminal trial by presenting inadequate argument in support of his motion for judgment of acquittal; claim that petitioner was prejudiced because properly argued motion for judgment of acquittal would probably have led trial court to grant motion on theory that there was insufficient evidence before jury to prove that he had acted with intent to kill victim.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Francis v. State (Memorandum Decision), 195 CA 906	242A
In re Brian P. (AC 43119), 195 CA 582	42A
<i>Termination of parental rights; subject matter jurisdiction; motion to intervene; standing; claim that trial court improperly denied paternal grandmother's motion to intervene; whether this court lacked subject matter jurisdiction; whether paternal grandmother had colorable claim to intervention as matter of right in satisfaction of applicable statute (§ 52-263); whether paternal grandmother had standing to appeal.</i>	
In re Brian P. (AC 43032), 195 CA 558	18A
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court improperly concluded that respondent parents failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation required by applicable statute (§ 17a-112); claim that trial court erred in terminating parents' parental rights solely on basis of parents' drug use and addiction; claim that trial court failed to determine needs of minor child before deciding whether parents had failed to rehabilitate; whether trial court properly found that termination of parents' parental rights was in best interest of minor child.</i>	
In re Siddiqui, 195 CA 594	54A
<i>Motion for cancellation of arrest warrant; subject matter jurisdiction; motions to reargue; whether this court had jurisdiction over petitioner's appeal; whether trial court's denial of motion for cancellation of arrest warrant terminated separate and distinct proceeding and, therefore, satisfied first prong of test set forth in State v. Curcio (191 Conn. 27); whether trial court properly determined that it lacked jurisdiction to consider motion for cancellation of arrest warrant; improper form of judgment.</i>	
In re Walker C., 195 CA 604	64A
<i>Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court erroneously found that child's attorney argued in favor of termination of mother's parental rights and that such error was not harmless; claim that trial court erred by not ordering permanent transfer of guardianship of child to foster mother.</i>	
Krausman v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co., 195 CA 682	142A
<i>Underinsured motorist coverage; claim that trial court's denial of motion for order of compliance with postjudgment interrogatories constituted final judgment for purposes of appeal; whether judgment on one part of three part complaint constituted final judgment; whether postjudgment discovery motion relating to one count of complaint was separate and distinct proceeding from pending remaining counts.</i>	
Matrix Financial Services Corp. v. Onofrio (Memorandum Decision), 195 CA 906	242A
SeMAC Electric Co. v. Skanska USA Building, Inc., 195 CA 695	155A
<i>Breach of contract; fraud; claim that trial court improperly rejected plaintiff subcontractor's claim that there had been cardinal change in contract terms; claim that trial court improperly concluded that plaintiff breached contract by abandoning project; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant general contractor materially breached contract with subcontractor by failing to provide subcontractor with forty-eight hour cure period before terminating contract; whether trial</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.

court's award of damages was erroneous; whether trial court erred in finding that individual third-party defendants did not commit fraud.

State v. Douglas C., 195 CA 728 188A

Risk of injury to child; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion for judgment of acquittal because there was insufficient evidence; three factor test used by Supreme Court in State v. Stephen J. R. (309 Conn. 586) to determine whether child victim's general or nonspecific testimony was sufficient to sustain conviction in sexual abuse case, discussed; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's request for specific unanimity instruction as to certain counts, depriving him of his constitutional right to unanimous jury verdict in violation of his rights under federal and state constitutions.

State v. Mitchell, 195 CA 543. 3A

Attempt to commit murder; conspiracy to commit murder; kidnapping in first degree; conspiracy to commit kidnapping in first degree; sexual assault in first degree; conspiracy to commit sexual assault in first degree; assault in first degree; conspiracy to commit assault in first degree; criminal possession of firearm; motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court improperly concluded that defendant's convictions for sexual assault in first degree and assault in first degree, predicated on liability under Pinkerton v. United States (328 U.S. 640), did not violate prohibition against double jeopardy when considered in light of conviction for conspiracy to commit kidnapping in first degree; whether certain crimes required proof of fact that others did not; whether statutes in question evinced clear legislative intent to prohibit defendant from being punished for offenses when offenses arise from same transaction; whether commission of substantive offense and conspiracy to commit substantive offense are separate and distinct offenses.

State v. White, 195 CA 618 78A

Home invasion; robbery in first degree; conspiracy to commit burglary in first degree; tampering with witness; claim that prosecutorial impropriety that occurred during state's examination of witness and closing argument deprived defendant of fair trial; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to suppress evidence that was seized pursuant to search warrant; whether search warrant was supported by probable cause; claim that facts set forth in search warrant affidavit did not provide probable cause to believe that items sought to be seized would be found in defendant's residence four months after home invasion; claim that facts set forth in affidavit were insufficient to demonstrate that defendant was participant in home invasion.

Volume 195 Cumulative Table of Cases 243A

CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK

Rules of Appellate Procedure—Adopted on Interim Basis. 1PB

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Connecticut Green Bank—Notice of Intent to Amend Operating Procedures. 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel 1C

Personnel Notice—Superior Court Operations—Small Claims/Motor Vehicle Magistrate Appointments 1C