

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 15 October 12, 2021 299 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Saint Paul, 338 C 651	127
<i>Arbitration; certification from Appellate Court; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's application to vacate arbitration award as untimely under state statute (§ 52-420 (b)) that imposed thirty day limitation period within which to file applications to vacate arbitration award; claim that plaintiff's application to vacate was not untimely because arbitration agreement specified that Federal Arbitration Act (9 U.S.C. § 1 et seq.) would apply to any arbitration between parties, and limitation period under applicable provision of that act (9 U.S.C. § 12) was three months; whether § 52-420 (b) implicated trial court's subject matter jurisdiction; whether § 52-420 (b) was preempted by Federal Arbitration Act.</i>	
Goshen Mortgage, LLC v. Androulidakis (Order), 338 C 913.	187
Ledyard v. WMS Gaming, Inc., 338 C 687	163
<i>Personal property taxes; attorney's fees; summary judgment; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly reversed trial court's decision to grant motion for summary judgment filed by plaintiff town and to deny motion for summary judgment filed by defendant property owner; claim that plaintiff town was entitled, pursuant to statute (§ 12-161a) that requires property owner to pay attorney's fees of municipality in action brought to collect delinquent personal property taxes when fees are "as a result of and directly related to" collection proceeding, to attorney's fees it incurred in defending federal action that was collateral to state collection action; claim that Appellate Court improperly applied restrictive interpretation of § 12-161a to characterize attorney's fees incurred in federal action as falling outside ambit of fees directly related to present collection proceeding; whether attorney's fees attributable to federal action were directly related to state collection proceeding.</i>	
Robb v. Connecticut Board of Veterinary Medicine (Order), 338 C 911	185
State v. Francis, 338 C 671	147
<i>Motion to correct illegal sentence for murder conviction; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had not abused its discretion in denying defendant's motion to correct; claim that sentencing court relied on materially inaccurate information when imposing defendant's sentence; whether sentencing court relied on inaccurate information concerning defendant's criminal history; claim that sentencing court substantially relied on false recollection of how victim died when imposing sentence.</i>	
State v. Komisarjevsky, 338 C 526.	2
<i>Capital felony; murder; kidnapping first degree; sexual assault first degree; burglary second degree; arson first degree; assault second degree; whether trial court improperly denied defendant's motion for change of venue from judicial district of New Haven due to pretrial publicity surrounding case, which involved notorious triple murder during home invasion; claim that pretrial publicity created irrebuttable presumption of prejudice that required moving trial from New Haven; claim that pretrial publicity resulted in actual prejudice that deprived defendant of fair trial; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's challenges for cause with respect to twelve potential jurors, none of whom actually deliberated on case or decided defendant's guilt; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's motions for continuance, to reopen evidence, and for mistrial, which were based on claim that state improperly failed to disclose certain letters</i>	

(continued on next page)

written by defendant's accomplice; claim that state violated defendant's due process rights under Brady v. Maryland (373 U.S. 83) by failing to disclose recordings of certain communications made by police officers during and after response to home invasion; standard by which defendant must prove existence of purported Brady violation, discussed; whether trial court correctly concluded that defendant had failed to establish by preponderance of evidence existence of purported e-mail and police communications log; whether certain undisclosed communications regarding police department's response during and following home invasion and describing demeanor and appearance of defendant and his accomplice were material under Brady; claim that state violated defendant's due process right to fair trial by presenting evidence that it knew or should have known to be false or misleading; reviewability of claim that statute (§ 18-10b) imposing certain restrictive conditions of confinement on inmates, like defendant, convicted of capital felony or murder with special circumstances constituted ex post facto law, violated equal protection, and resulted in excessive and disproportionate punishment.

State v. Lane (Order), 338 C 913 187
 State v. Oscar H. (Order), 338 C 912 186
 Stone Key Group, LLC v. Taradash (Orders), 338 C 912 186
 Villanueva v. Villanueva (Order), 338 C 913 187
 Volume 338 Cumulative Table of Cases 189

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bologna v. Bologna, 208 CA 218. 16A
Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly modified dissolution judgment when it denied plaintiff's postjudgment motion for clarification; whether trial court properly construed plaintiff's motion for clarification as impermissible motion for modification; whether trial court had authority to modify terms of parties' separation agreement.
 Danner v. Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities, 208 CA 234 32A
Administrative appeal; whether trial court properly considered plaintiff's affidavit as competent evidence in opposition to motion for summary judgment; whether trial court failed to afford deference to human rights referee's decision in conducting plenary review of record; whether trial court erred in considering whether genuine issues of material fact existed.
 Johnson v. Commissioner of Correction, 208 CA 204. 2A
Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in declining to issue writ of habeas corpus; interpretation of rule of practice (§ 23-24); whether petitioner's first and second habeas petitions were identical; whether decision by habeas court to decline to issue writ of habeas corpus was proper due to lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether retroactive application of 2013 amendment to risk reduction earned credit program for parole eligibility to petitioner violated

(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.

ex post facto clause of federal constitution; whether case was distinguishable from Whistnant v. Commissioner of Correction (199 Conn. App. 406) in context of habeas court's decision to decline to issue writ for lack of jurisdiction pursuant to § 23-24 (a) (1).

Robinson v. Tindill, 208 CA 255 53A

Trespass; whether trial court improperly found defendants liable for trespass; claim that privacy fence defendants constructed was divisional fence pursuant to statute (§ 47-43) and within permitted limit of intrusion on plaintiffs' property; unpreserved claim that trial court improperly found defendant property owner liable for trespass because split rail fence was fixture appurtenant to property she owned; claim that trial court improperly found codefendant liable for conversion where plaintiffs never pleaded conversion in complaint or briefed it in motion for summary judgment, and complaint alleged that conduct in dismantling portions of fence constituted trespass.

Volume 208 Cumulative Table of Cases 75A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

DSS—Notice of Proposed Medicaid State Plan Amendment (SPA). 1C

Housing Finance Authority, Connecticut 3C