


CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 11

September 14, 2021

309 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Mitchell v. State, 338 C 66	2
<i>Petition for new trial based on newly discovered evidence; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had not abused its discretion in denying petitioner's request for leave to file late petition for certification to appeal, as required by statute (§ 54-95 (a)); claim that trial court abused its discretion by improperly failing to consider reasons for petitioner's untimely filing of petition for certification to appeal and, instead, denied his request on basis of merits of his appeal; whether trial court abused its discretion by alternatively concluding that claims raised in petition for new trial did not warrant appellate review; whether technologically enhanced security camera footage that had been shown to jury depicting petitioner's coconspirator exiting car to approach victim's body would probably produce a different result at new trial; whether evidence that lead detective investigating petitioner's criminal case had been arrested and convicted of fraud in second degree following petitioner's criminal trial would have led to different result at new trial; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that evidence on which petitioner relied to demonstrate prosecutorial improprieties would be material at new trial.</i>	
State v. Gonzalez, 338 C 108	44
<i>Sexual assault first degree; home invasion; risk of injury to child; certification from Appellate Court; claim that defendant was denied his constitutional rights to present closing argument and to fair trial by virtue of prosecutor's cursory review of evidence during her initial closing summation followed by more detailed discussion of evidence during rebuttal argument; claim that defendant was denied his constitutional rights to present closing argument and to fair trial by virtue of prosecutor's mischaracterization of certain evidence.</i>	
Volume 388 Cumulative Table of Cases	91

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Barnes v. Greenwich Hospital, 207 CA 512	154A
<i>Medical malpractice; motions to dismiss; personal jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motions to dismiss medical malpractice complaint for failure to attach written opinion letter as required by statute (§ 52-190a); whether plaintiffs were permitted to amend their deficient complaint as of right pursuant to rule articulated in Gonzales v. Langdon (161 Conn. App. 497) after expiration of statute of limitations.</i>	
Brass City Local, Connecticut Alliance of City Police v. Waterbury, 207 CA 422	64A
<i>Arbitration; motion to vacate arbitration award; claim that trial court erred by granting motion to vacate arbitration award; whether arbitration panel's award was mutual, final and definite award; whether there was basis for trial court to remand to arbitration panel.</i>	
Carolina Casualty Ins. Co. v. Connecticut Solid Surface, LLC, 207 CA 525	167A
<i>Vexatious litigation; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment for cross claim defendant on vexatious litigation claim; whether prior action terminated in defendant's favor where there was promise by plaintiff in prior action to agree to dismissal of complaint in exchange for defendant's promise to agree to dismissal of counterclaim against that plaintiff.</i>	

(continued on next page)

High Watch Recovery Center, Inc. v. Dept. of Public Health, 207 CA 397	39A
<i>Administrative appeal; certificate of need; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court erred in granting defendants' motions to dismiss on ground that there was no final decision in contested case from which plaintiff could appeal; claim that trial court erred in concluding that letter written by plaintiff to Office of Health Care Access requesting to intervene was insufficient to constitute request for public hearing pursuant to statute ((Rev. to 2017) § 19a-639a (e)).</i>	
In re Probate Appeal of McIntyre, 207 CA 433	75A
<i>Probate appeal; Uniform Transfers to Minors Act (§ 45a-557 et seq.); claim that trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction to make certain of its orders relating to custodial arrangement for UTMA accounts that were not subject to decree of Probate Court from which plaintiff appealed; claim that trial court improperly placed burden on plaintiff to prove that his removal as custodian of UTMA account was not warranted.</i>	
Pimental v. River Junction Estates, LLC, 207 CA 361.	3A
<i>Quiet title; whether trial court erred in determining that there had been no implied dedication of certain portion of road as public highway.</i>	
Shaheer v. Commissioner of Correction, 207 CA 449.	91A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court improperly denied petition for writ of habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to timely raise defense of duress; adoption of habeas court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of relevant facts and applicable law on that issue.</i>	
State v. Lavecchia, 207 CA 537	179A
<i>Assault in third degree; reviewability of unreserved claim that trial court abused its discretion by permitting police officer to testify on ultimate issue in violation of § 7-3 of Connecticut Code of Evidence; reviewability of unreserved claim pursuant to State v. Golding (233 Conn. 213) that police officer's testimony violated defendant's constitutional rights; whether trial court abused its discretion by excluding from evidence psychiatric records of only direct witness to assault.</i>	
State v. Pierre, 207 CA 544.	186A
<i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; whether constitutional prohibition against double jeopardy was violated when sentencing court merged defendant's convictions of felony murder and manslaughter instead of vacating manslaughter conviction; whether defendant's right to be free of double jeopardy was violated when trial court failed to vacate one of two counts of kidnapping in first degree in violation of statute (§ 53a-92 (a) (2) (A) and (B)) of which he had been convicted.</i>	
State v. Yusef L., 207 CA 475.	117A
<i>Violation of probation; violation of protective order; strangulation in second degree; motion to vacate guilty pleas; whether trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to withdraw his guilty pleas; whether trial court failed to determine whether defendant fully understood maximum possible sentence that could result from consecutive sentences; whether trial court incorrectly advised defendant that mandatory minimum sentence applied; whether trial court failed to determine whether</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.

defendant fully understood that he had right to plead not guilty and right to assistance of counsel.

2772 BPR, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission, 207 CA 377. 19A
Zoning appeal; whether trial court erred in denying plaintiff's appeal from defendant planning and zoning commission's decision to deny plaintiff's site development plan application to build facility to be used for bulk storage of propane when proposed use was permitted as of right; whether trial court erred by upholding commission's consideration of off-site traffic concerns, preparedness of municipal services, and potential impact on neighborhood property values when conducting its administrative review; whether commission properly considered whether location of project on dead-end street limited access to emergency services.

Vossbrinck v. Hobart, 207 CA 490. 132A
Violation of constitutional rights; violation of state law; sovereign immunity; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant state marshal was entitled to sovereign immunity; whether trial court properly determined that defendant was entitled to statutory immunity (§ 6-38a (b)) when nothing in record raised genuine issue of material fact as to whether defendant's actions were wanton, reckless or malicious; whether trial court improperly failed to address claim under federal statute (42 U.S.C. § 1983).

Volume 207 Cumulative Table of Cases 195A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Suspension of Attorney 1C
Notice of Application for Reinstatement 1C