

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 8

August 24, 2021

298 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Doe v. Rackliffe, 337 C 627.	3
<i>Medical negligence; intentional sexual assault; negligent infliction of emotional distress; intentional infliction of emotional distress; claim that defendant pediatrician was liable for personal injuries sustained by plaintiffs stemming from sexual abuse that occurred during physical examinations when plaintiffs were minors; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that extended statute of limitations (§ 52-577d) applicable to actions for damages to minors caused by sexual abuse applied to plaintiff's medical negligence claims; whether limitation period set forth in § 52-577d or limitation period set forth in statute (§ 52-584) applicable to negligence or malpractice actions applies to claims for injuries sounding in negligence in absence of originating act of intentional sexual misconduct.</i>	
Ross v. Commissioner of Correction, 337 C 718.	94
<i>Habeas corpus; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that petitioner was collaterally estopped from litigating issue of whether he was prejudiced by his trial counsel's failure to object to prosecutor's improper remarks during closing argument; whether issue raised was identical to that presented in petitioner's direct appeal of his conviction; whether petitioner demonstrated that he was prejudiced by his trial counsel's failure to object to prosecutor's improper remarks.</i>	
State v. Angel M., 337 C 655	31
<i>Sexual assault first degree; attempt to commit sexual assault first degree; risk of injury to child; certification from Appellate Court; claim that trial court had violated defendant's right to due process by improperly augmenting his sentence for his refusal to apologize to two victims after he had been found guilty of crimes charged in connection with his sexual assault of one of those victims; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had not punished defendant for invoking his right against self-incrimination and for refusing to apologize to victims.</i>	
State v. Imperiale, 337 C 694.	70
<i>Revocation of probation; sex offender treatment as condition of probation; motion to dismiss violation of probation charge; claim that defendant's placement at inpatient sex offender treatment facility upon release from prison as condition of probation violated his right to due process on ground that it was functional equivalent of incarceration; whether defendant's placement at facility furthered rehabilitative and public safety purposes of probation; claim that subjecting defendant to highly restrictive conditions at sex offender treatment facility violated his right to equal protection on ground that he was placed there due to his status as homeless person upon his release from prison; claim that requiring defendant to attend sex offender treatment program at facility as condition of probation violated his eighth amendment right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment.</i>	
State v. Stephenson, 337 C 643	19
<i>Burglary third degree; attempt to commit tampering with physical evidence; attempt to commit arson second degree; whether Appellate Court improperly addressed, sua sponte, issue of evidentiary sufficiency distinct from defendant's claim, without calling for supplemental briefing as required by Blumberg Associates Worldwide, Inc. v. Brown & Brown of Connecticut, Inc. (311 Conn. 123).</i>	
Volume 337 Cumulative Table of Cases	115

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Gutierrez v. Mosor, 206 CA 818	66A
<i>Negligence; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting plaintiff's motion for default as sanction for defendant's single discovery violation for failure to attend scheduled deposition; whether trial court abused its discretion by failing to grant defendant's motion to set aside default; whether trial court's sanction of default was proportional to defendant's violation of discovery order.</i>	
Kenmore Road Assn., Inc. v. Bloomfield, 206 CA 877	125A
<i>Declaratory judgment; action seeking judgment declaring that defendant town had accepted certain private road as public road; whether trial court's findings that plaintiff had not impliedly dedicated road to public use nor had defendant or public impliedly accepted road for such use were supported by record and, therefore, were not clearly erroneous.</i>	
Lift-Up, Inc. v. Colony Ins. Co., 206 CA 855	103A
<i>Declaratory judgment; summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in holding that exclusion provisions under insurance policy pertaining to assault or battery applied to plaintiffs' claims and that there was no coverage under policy; whether certain conduct constituted assault or battery or both; whether certain injuries arose out of assault or battery or both; claim that trial court improperly confined its analysis to operative complaint and refused to consider certain pieces of extrinsic evidence; whether certain documents were sufficient to support plaintiffs' claims that defendant insurance company had duty to defend.</i>	
Rockstone Capital, LLC v. Caldwell, 206 CA 801	49A
<i>Foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly determined that settlement agreement secured by defendants' real property was procedurally and substantively unconscionable with respect to one defendant; whether defendant received consideration for her agreement to mortgage her interest in her jointly owned residence to secure debt of another defendant.</i>	
State v. Gamble, 206 CA 837	85A
<i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; manslaughter in first degree with firearm; whether trial court improperly dismissed motion to correct for lack of jurisdiction on ground that motion attacked conviction, and not sentence; claim that defendant's sentence was illegally enhanced on basis of fact not found by jury.</i>	
State v. Stephanie U., 206 CA 754	2A
<i>Operating motor vehicle while under influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs; operating motor vehicle while operator's license was suspended; attempt to commit risk of injury to child; whether prosecutor violated defendant's state constitutional rights to confront witnesses against her and to testify on her own behalf by improperly attacking her credibility during cross-examination and in closing rebuttal argument by suggesting that she had tailored her testimony to conform to evidence she overheard during trial; whether prosecutor denied defendant due process of law under either federal or state constitution when she asked, during cross-examination, whether defendant had interest in outcome of trial and when she told jury</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.

during rebuttal argument that it could consider defendant's vested interest in outcome of trial; whether prosecutorial impropriety deprived defendant of fair trial when prosecutor argued that defendant had tailored her testimony and that she had motive to lie; claim that this court should have ordered new trial after employing its supervisory authority to prohibit questions and arguments that amount to generic tailoring or imply that jury could discredit defendant's testimony because she had interest in outcome of her trial; claim that defendant's conviction of attempt to commit risk of injury to child should be vacated because it was not cognizable crime.

Volume 206 Cumulative Table of Cases 133A

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Amendment to Bar Examining Committee Regulations 1B
 CT Bar Exam Committee—Notice of Application with & without Exam 3B
 Notice of Hearing 4B

ASSIGNMENT OF JUDGES

Assignment of Judges 21–22 1C
