

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 12

September 21, 2021

338 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

<p>Kent Literary Club of Wesleyan University v. Wesleyan University, 338 C 189</p> <p><i>Termination of agreement by defendant university to allow fraternity to house its members in on-campus fraternity house; promissory estoppel; negligent misrepresentation; tortious interference with business expectancies; alleged violations of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA); whether trial court improperly declined to instruct jury, in accordance with defendants' request, that party cannot prevail on claim of promissory estoppel based on alleged promises that contradict terms of written contract; whether trial court was required to instruct jury, in accordance with defendants' request, that principle of promissory estoppel applies only when there is no enforceable contract between parties; whether trial court should have instructed jury as to legal implications of parties' agreement in connection with plaintiffs' CUTPA claim; claim that trial court improperly failed to instruct jury that, in light of parties' agreement, plaintiffs could not reasonably have relied on any perceived extracontractual promise or representation by university that fraternity could continue to house its members; whether trial court failed to properly instruct jury as to correct method of calculating damages and law governing damages that may be recovered for tortious interference with business expectancies; whether trial court failed to instruct jury as to proper measure of losses in connection with plaintiffs' negligent misrepresentation claim; whether there was sufficient evidence for jury to find that university intentionally misled plaintiffs during negotiations, leading plaintiffs to reasonably rely on university's representations that fraternity could continue to house its members; claim that trial court improperly instructed jury that it should find that university committed unfair trade practice or practices under CUTPA if its conduct violated cigarette rule, rather than federal standard applied by Federal Trade Commission and federal courts under Federal Trade Commission Act; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting plaintiffs injunctive relief.</i></p>	<p>37</p>
<p>New Haven v. AFSCME, Council 4, Local 3144, 338 C 154</p> <p><i>Arbitration; termination of employment; application to vacate arbitration award; application to confirm arbitration award; whether trial court properly confirmed arbitration award; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that arbitration award reinstating grievant did not violate public policy; whether defendant city failed to meet its burden of demonstrating that reinstatement of grievant's employment violated public policy; factors reviewing court should consider when determining whether termination of employment is sole means to vindicate public policy, set forth and discussed; claim that public sector employer should not have to countenance conduct by executive level employee in fiscally sensitive position that has negative impact on public accountability and public confidence.</i></p>	<p>2</p>
<p>State v. Christopher S., 338 C 255.</p> <p><i>Strangulation second degree; assault third degree; whether Appellate Court improperly upheld trial court's decision to admit defendant's unrecorded, written confession into evidence on ground that state had failed to meet its burden of proving, in accordance with statute (§ 54-1o (h)), that confession was voluntarily given and reliable under totality of circumstances; whether defendant's claim regarding § 54-1o (h) was constitutional or evidentiary; whether record supported trial court's determination that there was no violation of Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436); whether totality of circumstances surrounding defendant's interrogation supported trial court's determination that defendant's confession was voluntarily</i></p>	<p>103</p>

(continued on next page)

given and was reliable; request that this court exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to require trial courts to give special instruction in all cases in which police fail to record custodial interrogation.

Volume 338 Cumulative Table of Cases 159

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of New York Mellon <i>v.</i> Moffatt (Memorandum Decision), 207 CA 901	163A
Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities <i>v.</i> Cantillon, 207 CA 668	120A
<i>Administrative appeal; claim that human rights referee of defendant Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities acted unreasonably and arbitrarily in her decision not to increase amount of damages awarded in action alleging discrimination in housing; whether trial court abused its discretion in dismissing appeal of plaintiff Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities and in affirming referee's decision; whether referee or trial court misinterpreted or misapplied Patino v. Birken Mfg. Co. (304 Conn. 679) in determination of emotional distress damages; whether referee or trial court misapplied factors set forth in Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities ex rel. Harrison v. Greco (CHRO No. 7930433) in calculation of emotional distress damages.</i>	
Kloiber <i>v.</i> Jellen, 207 CA 616.	68A
<i>Trespass; private nuisance; common-law negligence; statutory negligence; subject matter jurisdiction; standing; whether plaintiffs lacked standing to maintain action in their individual capacities against defendants; whether self-represented plaintiffs could maintain action on behalf of limited liability company.</i>	
Mobley <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 207 CA 901	163A
NRT New England, LLC <i>v.</i> Longo, 207 CA 588	40A
<i>Breach of contract; Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); claim that trial court improperly refused to dismiss plaintiff's action for lack of standing; whether plaintiff's lack of full compliance with statute (§ 20-325a) governing actions to recover real estate commissions implicated trial court's subject matter jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly concluded that defendants had breached real estate listing agreement; whether trial court's factual finding was clearly erroneous and basis for conclusion that defendants breached agreement; claim that trial court improperly concluded that defendants violated CUTPA; whether actions of defendants were performed in conduct of trade or commerce for purposes of CUTPA.</i>	
Onofrio <i>v.</i> Mineri, 207 CA 630	82A
<i>Breach of contract; negligent misrepresentation; negligence; breach of warranties; fraudulent concealment; Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); whether defendants adequately briefed claim that trial court's judgment was inconsistent; whether trial court properly extended CUTPA liability from defendant business entity to defendant officer of that entity; whether trial court properly extended CUTPA liability from defendant business entity to separate business entity that had jointly coordinated activities; whether defendant, as builder of</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.

new home that was sold by intermediary vendor, was vendor pursuant to statute (§ 47-118) and, thus, liable for breach of implied warranty.

State v. Yury G., 207 CA 686 138A

Disorderly conduct; whether trial court correctly determined that defendant's request that jury be instructed on infraction of creating public disturbance as lesser included offense of disorderly conduct did not meet prerequisites set forth in State v. Whistnant (179 Conn. 576) for obtaining jury instruction on lesser included offense; reviewability of defendant's unpreserved claim that statutory scheme giving prosecutor complete discretion in choosing whether to charge her with infraction or with misdemeanor containing identical elements to infraction violated her state and federal constitutional rights; reviewability of defendant's unpreserved claim that statutory scheme giving prosecutor complete discretion in choosing whether to charge her with infraction or with misdemeanor containing identical elements to infraction violated separation of powers provision of Connecticut constitution; claim that trial court improperly instructed jury to consider affidavit that had been admitted as full exhibit only for impeachment purposes.

Strazza Building & Construction, Inc. v. Harris, 207 CA 649. 101A

Foreclosure of mechanic's lien; breach of contract; unjust enrichment; motion for summary judgment; whether trial court erred in failing to find that plaintiff's action was barred by res judicata and collateral estoppel; whether trial court correctly concluded that there was genuine issue of material fact as to whether there was sufficient privity between subcontractor and general contractor so as to preclude general contractor from pursuing claims against property owner; whether trial court improperly applied presumption of privity; claim that right of general contractor to intervene in action by subcontractor involving mechanic's lien established privity.

United Concrete Products, Inc. v. NJR Construction, LLC, 207 CA 551 3A

Breach of contract; payment bond; unfair trade practices; action by subcontractor to recover damages for breach of contract from defendant general contractor and from defendant insurance company for failure to satisfy statutory (§ 49-42) requirement to pay claim on payment bond; whether trial court's use of subcontract's delivery date to calculate damages on general contractor's counterclaim for breach of contract was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court improperly declined to find that general contractor failed to mitigate damages; reviewability of claim, raised for first time on appeal, that trial court erred by failing to award plaintiff attorney's fees and interest pursuant to statute (§ 49-41a); whether trial court erred in rendering judgment for insurance company on plaintiff's claim under payment bond where no language in payment bond or in §§ 49-41a or 49-42 prevented insurance company, as surety, from being held jointly and severally liable for amount that general contractor, as principal, was liable; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that plaintiff's actions constituted unfair trade practices; whether trial court's award of attorney's fees and expenses to general contractor was erroneous.

Volume 207 Cumulative Table of Cases 165A

NOTICE OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

CT Paid Leave Authority—Notice of Intent to Revise its Policies & Procedures 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Suspension of Attorney and Appointment of Trustee. 1C
Notice of Attorney Placed on Inactive Status 2C
Notice of Application for Reinstatement to the Bar 2C