

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

---

VOL. LXXXIII No. 13                      September 28, 2021                      404 Pages

---

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Charles F. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 388 C 902 . . . . .	104
Dobie v. New Haven (Order), 388 C 901 . . . . .	103
Francis v. Board of Pardons & Paroles, 388 C 347 . . . . .	39
<i>Declaratory judgment action; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly affirmed judgment of trial court dismissing as unripe action brought by plaintiff, an inmate convicted of murder; claim that statute (§ 54-125g) concerning parole of prisoners nearing end of maximum sentence applies to persons convicted of murder; claim that defendant Commissioner of Correction must consider plaintiff's eligibility for parole under § 54-125g in calculating his estimated release date; whether term "definite sentence," as used in § 54-125g, refers to full sentence imposed by sentencing court or to sentence inmate will actually serve, as reduced by various statutory credits; whether plaintiff had specific, personal and legal interest in applicability of § 54-125g to persons convicted of murder when plaintiff would, with virtual certainty, never serve 95 percent of his definite sentence, as required by § 54-125g.</i>	
In re Annessa J. (Orders), 388 C 904, 905, 906 . . . . .	106
In re Naomi W. (Order), 388 C 906 . . . . .	108
In re Sequoia G. (Order), 388 C 904. . . . .	106
McCrea v. Cumberland Farms, Inc. (Order), 388 C 901 . . . . .	103
Meriden v. Freedom of Information Commission, 388 C 310 . . . . .	2
<i>Alleged violation of Freedom of Information Act (§ 1-200 et seq.); administrative appeal; dismissal of administrative appeal on ground that plaintiff city and city council did not violate open meeting requirements of applicable provision (§ 1-225 (a)) of Freedom of Information Act; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly determined that phrase "hearing or other proceeding," as used in Freedom of Information Act (§ 1-200 (2)), referred to process of adjudication; claim that there was sufficient evidence in record to conclude that gathering constituting less than quorum of city council members was "hearing or other proceeding" of public agency within meaning of § 1-200 (2) and that plaintiffs had failed to comply with open meeting requirements of § 1-225 (a).</i>	
Mirlis v. Yeshiva of New Haven, Inc. (Order), 388 C 903. . . . .	105
Moore v. Commissioner of Correction, 388 C 330. . . . .	22
<i>Habeas corpus; robbery first degree; commission of class B felony with firearm; ineffective assistance of counsel; denial of certification to appeal from habeas court's denial of habeas petition; certification from Appellate Court; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to correct material misunderstanding of law that was expressed by petitioner and that was relevant to petitioner's decision whether to accept plea offer; whether petitioner established that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to advise petitioner that potential sentence exposure if petitioner succeeded at trial in proving lesser offense was as severe as period of incarceration in state's plea offers; whether Appellate Court properly dismissed petitioner's appeal.</i>	
Small v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 388 C 902 . . . . .	104
Smith v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 388 C 903 . . . . .	105
State v. Jose R., 388 C 375 . . . . .	67
<i>Sexual assault first degree; risk of injury to child; prosecutorial impropriety; whether trial court improperly imposed sentence that included period of probation for convictions of sexual assault first degree, in violation of statutes (§ 53a-29 (a))</i>	

(continued on next page)

*and (Rev. to 2013) § 53a-70 (b) (3)); whether certain improper remarks made by prosecutor during closing and rebuttal arguments violated defendant's due process right to fair trial and right against self-incrimination; request to overrule State v. Payne (303 Conn. 538); claim that prosecutor improperly commented on defendant's failure to testify by contrasting victim's in-court testimony with defendant's out-of-court statements, by asking jurors whether there was any reasonable explanation why they should not find victim credible, and by remarking that credibility of party is best determined by how that party performs on cross-examination, when defendant did not testify at trial; claim that certain remarks by prosecutor constituted improper expression of personal opinion regarding victim's credibility and defendant's guilt when remarks were predicated on ambiguous testimony and reasonable inferences drawn from that testimony.*

Tarasco v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 388 C 902 . . . . .	104
Vere C. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 388 C 903 . . . . .	105
Viking Construction, Inc. v. TMP Construction Group, LLC, 388 C 361 . . . . .	53
<i>Breach of contract; whether trial court improperly denied defendant subcontractor's motion to set aside jury verdict; whether provisions of contract between plaintiff general contractor and defendant subcontractor precluded award of money damages; whether defendant presented adequate record on appeal.</i>	
Volume 338 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	109

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Anketell v. Kulldorff, 207 CA 807 . . . . .	103A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court erred by failing to identify presumptive child support obligation under child support guidelines set forth in applicable regulations (§ 42b-215a-1 et seq.) before entering support order based on deviation; claim that trial court erred in calculating parties' incomes with respect to its determination of child support award; claim that trial court erred in awarding plaintiff lump sum property settlement; claim that trial court abused its discretion in awarding appellate attorney's fees to plaintiff; claim that trial court abused its discretion in entering its custodial orders.</i>	
Baldwin v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 207 CA 903 . . . . .	187A
Berka v. Middletown (Memorandum Decision), 207 CA 903 . . . . .	187A
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Montanaro (Memorandum Decision), 207 CA 902 . . . . .	186A
Heyward v. Leftridge (Memorandum Decision), 207 CA 902 . . . . .	186A
Holliday v. UConn Health (Memorandum Decision), 207 CA 903 . . . . .	187A
Jackson v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 207 CA 902 . . . . .	186A
Joyner v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 207 CA 904 . . . . .	188A
Medical Device Solutions, LLC v. Aferzon, 207 CA 707 . . . . .	3A
<i>Breach of contract; violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); whether trial court impermissibly considered parol evidence in determining that parties entered into enforceable contract; claim that parties' written agreement was integrated as to certain commitments that agreement stated</i>	

### 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](http://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.

(continued on next page)

*were to be subject of separate agreement; whether trial court properly determined that defendants' patented device and plaintiff's prototype were within scope of parties' agreement; claim that trial court improperly concluded that patented device was version of device depicted in initial sketches of device; claim that trial court failed to apply certain language in written agreement when analyzing whether defendants' licensed patent was associated with device depicted in initial drawings or was version thereof; whether trial court improperly concluded that any statute of limitations applicable to plaintiff's claims was tolled pursuant to statute (§ 52-595) concerning fraudulent concealment and continuing course of conduct doctrine; applicability of six year statute of limitations (§ 52-576) for contract actions to plaintiff's breach of contract claim; reduction of trial court's award of expectation damages on breach of contract claim because of viability of defendants' special defense under statute of limitations; reduction of prejudgment interest awarded pursuant to statute (§ 37-3a) where trial court erroneously calculated award; whether trial court properly found that certain breaches of parties' agreement were committed in bad faith and constituted violations of CUTPA; remand of case for determination, if possible, of what portion of trial court's award of attorney's fees and costs were reasonably incurred to litigate portion of CUTPA claim that was not barred by statute of limitations (§ 42-110g); whether trial court erred in determining amount of offer of compromise interest pursuant to statute (§ 52-192a (c)) to which plaintiff was entitled; remand of case for recalculation of offer of compromise interest where trial court improperly calculated interest.*

State v. Fields, 207 CA 791 . . . . . 87A

*Operating motor vehicle while under influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs; operating motor vehicle while having elevated blood alcohol content; claim that trial court improperly declined to suppress evidence of field sobriety test, search warrant application and defendant's blood alcohol content because that evidence was tainted fruit of illegal detention of defendant by police; whether detention of defendant was constitutionally permissible; whether evidence of blood alcohol content was admissible under independent source doctrine.*

McNamara v. McNamara, 207 CA 849. . . . . 145A

*Marital dissolution; postjudgment proceedings; motion for modification; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting motion to withdraw appearance filed by defendant's counsel; claim that trial court violated defendant's right to procedural due process in denying her motion for continuance; reviewability of claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's motion for continuance; whether trial court abused its discretion in awarding plaintiff final decision-making authority on issues concerning children's health, treatment, and selection of therapeutic providers.*

Volume 207 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 191A

Ulanoff v. Becker Salon, LLC, 208 CA 1 . . . . . 199A

*Negligence; personal injury; claim that trial court erred by precluding plaintiff from introducing into evidence photograph of entryway to defendants' business, where her accident occurred, which she had obtained from defendant's website; claim that trial court erred in prohibiting plaintiff from questioning witness about appearance of entryway on date prior to incident; claim that cumulative effect of trial court's allegedly erroneous rulings was harmful.*

Tannenbaum v. Tannenbaum, 208 CA 16. . . . . 214A

*Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court improperly modified parties' custody agreement regarding air travel relating to minor child.*

JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Malick, 208 CA 38 . . . . . 236A

*Foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment of strict foreclosure; whether trial court erred as matter of law when it accepted affidavit of debt and relied on it to establish amount of defendant's indebtedness even though defendant had articulated specific objections to amount of mortgage debt; whether trial court properly applied rule of practice (§ 23-18 (a)) in permitting plaintiff to prove amount of debt by submission of affidavit; whether defendant's articulated objections concerning amount of mortgage debt were sufficient to render application of § 23-18 improper.*

State v. Luna, 208 CA 45 . . . . . 243A

*Misconduct with motor vehicle; assault in third degree; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction; claim that evidence was insufficient for jury to determine that defendant acted with criminal negligence; claim that trial court abused its discretion and violated defendant's constitutional right to present defense when*

(continued on next page)

*it precluded her from introducing toxicology report into evidence; claim that admission into evidence of death certificate violated defendant's sixth amendment right to confrontation because death certificate contained testimonial hearsay; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to conflict free representation when trial court failed to inquire, sua sponte, into conflict of interest defense counsel created.*

Volume 208 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 273A

**CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK**

Notice of Rules of Appellate Procedure . . . . . 1PB

**NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES**

DSS—Notice of Proposed Medicaid State Plan Amendment (SPA). . . . . 1B  
DEEP—Notice of Ground Water Quality Reclassification Decision. . . . . 3B

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel . . . . . 1C  
Bar Examining Committee . . . . . 2C  
Notice of Pendency of Reinstatement Application . . . . . 3C  
Notice of Suspension of Attorneys . . . . . 3C