

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 6

August 10, 2021

267 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

State v. Carey, 337 C 463	37
<i>Murder; self-defense; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that any error relating to admission of witness' testimony, which was admitted to demonstrate that victim had been afraid of defendant, was harmless.</i>	
State v. Jones, 337 C 486	60
<i>Murder; carrying pistol without permit; criminal possession of firearm; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court improperly had declined to give jury special credibility instruction regarding jailhouse informants in light of benefits that witness expected to receive from state in exchange for his cooperation; claim that rule in State v. Patterson (276 Conn. 452), requiring special credibility instruction with respect to testimony of jailhouse informants, should apply to any prison inmate who approaches police with information regarding inculpatory statements made by defendant, regardless of whether inculpatory statements were made in prison environment; whether trial court's failure to give special credibility instruction was harmful.</i>	
State v. Manuel T., 337 C 429	3
<i>Risk of injury to child; sexual assault first degree; sexual assault second degree; sexual assault fourth degree; certification from Appellate Court; claim that this court should overrule prior Appellate Court precedent and adopt standard under which statements made by minor child abuse victim during forensic interview can be admitted under medical treatment exception to hearsay rule only if victim's primary purpose in making statements was to obtain medical diagnosis or treatment; whether Appellate Court incorrectly determined that trial court had not abused its discretion in excluding, for lack of authentication, screenshots of certain text messages purportedly sent by victim to defendant's niece.</i>	
State v. Dawson (Order) (replacement page), 333 C 906	v
Volume 337 Cumulative Table of Cases	101

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bellerive v. Grotto, Inc., 206 CA 702	132A
<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly reversed decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner determining that certain insurance coverage was in effect on date of plaintiff's injury; claim that defendant insurer's notice of cancellation of policy pursuant to statute (§ 31-348) was ineffective because it was not made in accordance with requirements of statute (§ 31-321); whether certain common-law theories supported finding that insurance coverage was in place on date of loss under facts of case.</i>	
Capone v. Nizzardo, 206 CA 645	75A
<i>Partition of real property; claim that trial court committed plain error when it determined highest and best use of property without reviewing applicable zoning regulations; whether plaintiff met either prong of plain error doctrine; claim that trial court's determination of highest and best use of property was clearly erroneous.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Cocchia v. Testa, 206 CA 634	64A
<i>Breach of contract; personal jurisdiction; motion to dismiss; motion to substitute; claim that trial court improperly denied postjudgment motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction because defendant was not properly cited in as defendant.</i>	
Guiliano v. Jefferson Radiology, P.C., 206 CA 603	33A
<i>Medical malpractice; whether trial court abused its discretion by sustaining objections by defendant's counsel to certain questions posed to plaintiff's expert witness on direct examination; whether trial court abused its discretion by imposing time limitation on presentation of witness' testimony; whether time limitation imposed on witness' testimony constituted violation of plaintiff's constitutional rights.</i>	
Hasan v. Commissioner of Correction, 206 CA 695	125A
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed petitioner's third petition for writ of habeas corpus as untimely pursuant to applicable statute (§ 52-470 (d) and (e)); whether petitioner failed to overcome rebuttable presumption that he lacked good cause for filing petition beyond statutory deadline; whether petitioner's assertion of claim of actual innocence and reference to new evidence for first time at show cause hearing were sufficient to overcome presumption that delay was without good cause.</i>	
In re Annessa J., 206 CA 572.	2A
<i>Termination of parental rights; motion for posttermination visitation; reviewability of respondent mother's unreserved claims that trial court proceedings to terminate her parental rights held over remote platform violated her state and federal constitutional rights; reviewability of mother's claim that trial court violated her right to due process of law in denying her motion for permission to allow her expert witness to review certain information; reviewability of respondent father's claim that trial court erred in concluding that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify him with minor child; whether sufficient evidence in record supported trial court's conclusion that father failed to achieve personal degree of rehabilitation within a reasonable period of time pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112 (j) (3) (B) (i)); whether trial court erred in determining that termination of father's parental rights was in best interest of minor child pursuant to statutory (§ 17a-112 (k)) factors; whether trial court applied correct legal standard in denying respondent parents' motions for posttermination visitation with minor child, pursuant to statute (§ 46b-121 (b) (1)) and our Supreme Court's decision in In re Ava W. (336 Conn. 545).</i>	
KeyBank, N.A. v. Yazar, 206 CA 625	55A
<i>Foreclosure; summary judgment; Emergency Mortgage Assistance Program statutory (§ 8-265ee (a)) notice; whether plaintiff's failure to comply with notice requirement of § 8-265ee (a) deprived trial court of subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiff may rely on notice that had been sent by original lender in prior foreclosure action that was later dismissed to satisfy its own notice requirements in separate foreclosure action.</i>	
State v. Morlo M., 206 CA 660	90A
<i>Assault in first degree; risk of injury to child; unlawful restraint in first degree; whether state failed to prove that defendant caused victim serious physical injury,</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.

and, thus, that evidence was insufficient to support conviction of assault in first degree; whether evidence was insufficient to support conviction of risk of injury to child, where defendant was charged under portion of risk of injury statute (§ 53-21 (a) (1)) that required that he have general intent to perform act that created situation that put children’s health and morals at risk of impairment; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of unlawful restraint in first degree; claim that defendant’s intent to unlawfully restrain victim was not independent from defendant’s intent to assault victim; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting evidence of two incidents of prior misconduct in which defendant was alleged to have assaulted victim; claim that probative value of prior misconduct evidence was outweighed by prejudicial effect; claim that prior misconduct evidence was likely to arouse emotions of jurors and sympathy toward victim.

State v. Morlo M. (replacement pages), 198 CA 747–48 vii
 Volume 206 Cumulative Table of Cases 143A

CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK

Rules of Appellate Procedure 1PB

MISCELLANEOUS

Notices of Attorney Discipline 1B
