

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXII No. 37 March 16, 2021 239 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

A & R Enterprises, LLC <i>v.</i> Sentinel Ins. Co., Ltd. (Order), 336 C 921	67
Bank of America, National Assn. <i>v.</i> Sorrentino (Order), 336 C 922	68
Coleman <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Order), 336 C 922	68
Gould <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Order), 336 C 921	67
In re Zakai F., 336 C 272	2
<i>Petition for reinstatement of guardianship rights pursuant to statute (§ 45a-611); certification from Appellate Court; whether parent seeking reinstatement of guardianship rights is entitled to rebuttable, constitutional presumption that reinstatement is in best interests of child once parent has established that cause for removal no longer exists; whether third party seeking to rebut presumption that reinstatement of guardianship is in child's best interests must do so by clear and convincing evidence; weighing of factors set forth in Mathews v. Eldridge (424 U.S. 319) for purpose of determining proper standard of proof in reinstatement of guardianship proceedings.</i>	
Nationstar Mortgage, LLC <i>v.</i> Zanett (Order), 336 C 919	65
Roberts <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Order), 336 C 920	66
Rose <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Order), 336 C 920	66
St. Louis <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Order), 336 C 919	65
State <i>v.</i> Edwards (Order), 336 C 920	66
State <i>v.</i> Sebben (Order), 336 C 919	65
Volume 336 Cumulative Table of Cases	69

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Berman <i>v.</i> Berman, 203 CA 300	70A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment modification of alimony; whether trial court improperly found that defendant had relinquished claims she might have had to certain marital assets in exchange for lifetime alimony; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for modification of alimony on basis of erroneous finding.</i>	
Boutlier <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 203 CA 901	133A
Buie <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction, 203 CA 232	2A
<i>Habeas corpus; mootness; claim that habeas court improperly determined that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over habeas petition and denied petition for certification to appeal; whether this court could afford petitioner practical relief.</i>	
C & H Shoreline, LLC <i>v.</i> Rubino, 203 CA 351	121A
<i>Breach of contract; whether trial court properly rendered judgment for defendants on basis that plaintiff's claims were contractually time barred; whether contractual limitation period was ambiguous as to whether term "claiming party" referred only to client or to any party asserting cause of action relating to agreement; application of contra proferentem rule to resolve ambiguity in agreement against drafter.</i>	
Disciplinary Counsel <i>v.</i> Cannatelli, 203 CA 236	6A
<i>Attorney misconduct; presentment; appeal from judgment of trial court suspending respondent attorney from practice of law; claim that trial court erred in denying respondent's postjudgment motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that trial court lacked jurisdiction because hearing on respondent's</i>	

(continued on next page)

presentment was not held within sixty days of filing thereof, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 2-47 (a)).

Estate of James E. Fry *v.* Lobbuzzo (Memorandum Decision), 203 CA 901 133A

Houghtaling *v.* Commissioner of Correction, 203 CA 246 16A

Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance during litigation of motion to suppress evidence at criminal trial; whether trial counsel's failure to call witness at hearing on motion to suppress fell below objective standard of reasonableness; claim that trial counsel rendered deficient performance by relying on Baker v. Carr (369 U.S. 186), rather than Katz v. United States (389 U.S. 347), in memorandum in support of motion to suppress; claim that habeas court deprived petitioner of state and federal constitutional rights to due process of law by analyzing, in its memorandum of decision, exhibit that had been admitted as full exhibit at habeas trial as exhibit admitted only for limited purpose; whether habeas court erroneously excluded certain evidence.

Osbourne *v.* Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 203 CA 902. 134A

St. Pierre *v.* Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 203 CA 901. 133A

Solek *v.* Commissioner of Correction, 203 CA 289 59A

Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court improperly determined that petitioner had not established good cause for untimely filing sufficient to rebut statutory (§ 52-470) presumption of unwarranted delay; reviewability on appeal of claim raised for first time in petitioner's reply brief; whether petitioner demonstrated that habeas court's conclusion that he had not demonstrated good cause for delay was debatable among jurists of reason, court could resolve issue differently or questions raised deserved encouragement to proceed further; whether record was adequate to review claim that petitioner's severe mental health issues provided good cause for delay; whether habeas court failed to provide petitioner with meaningful opportunity to investigate and to present evidence as to good cause for delay in filing petition.

State *v.* Capasso, 203 CA 333 103A

Reckless burning; false reporting of incident in second degree; sufficiency of evidence; whether state was required to prove that building in danger of destruction or damage referenced in reckless burning statute (§ 53a-114) was owned exclusively by someone other than defendant; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's motion to set aside verdict on ground that conviction for reckless burning was against weight of evidence.

Stephenson *v.* Commissioner of Correction, 203 CA 314. 84A

Habeas corpus; subject matter jurisdiction; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether petitioner sufficiently alleged claim under stigma plus test; whether claim of misapplication of parole eligibility statute (§ 54-125a) gave rise to cognizable liberty interest sufficient to invoke subject matter jurisdiction of habeas court.

U.S. Bank, N.A. *v.* Hickey (Memorandum Decision), 203 CA 902 134A

Volume 203 Cumulative Table of Cases 135A

(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

CT Bar Examining Committee—Notices of Application	1B
Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel	2B
Notice of Administrative Suspension of Attorneys	3B
