

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 16 October 19, 2021 263 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Anderson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 338 C 914	132
Caliber Home Loans, Inc. v. Zeller (Order), 338 C 914	132
Clark v. Waterford, Cohanzie Fire Dept. (Order), 338 C 916.	134
Dunn v. Northeast Helicopters Flight Services, LLC (Order), 338 C 915.	133
Hernandez v. Apple Auto Wholesalers of Waterbury, LLC, 338 C 803	101
<i>Alleged violations of Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.) and Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); default judgment; motions for summary judgment; certification of questions of law from United States District Court for District of Connecticut pursuant to statute (§ 51-199 (d)); when limit on assignee's liability is determined for purposes of applying applicable statute (§ 52-572g (a)); whether assignee can avoid liability under § 52-572g by reassigning promissory note, contract or other instrument back to seller, and, if so, by what point in time must assignee do so to avoid liability; whether, if retail installment contract includes Federal Trade Commission holder rule language mandated by federal law (16 C.F.R. § 433.2), assignee's liability under that rule is cumulative to its liability under § 52-572g.</i>	
Kelly Services, Inc. v. Senior Network, Inc., 338 C 794.	92
<i>Breach of contract; claim that trial court improperly awarded plaintiff postjudgment interest pursuant to statute (§ 52-192a (c)) authorizing court to award interest from date of offer of compromise if defendant fails to accept offer and plaintiff recovers amount equal to or greater than amount proposed in offer.</i>	
Marshall v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 338 C 916	134
Moulthrop v. State Board of Education (Order), 338 C 915	133
Oudheusden v. Oudheusden, 338 C 761.	59
<i>Dissolution of marriage; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that trial court had abused its discretion in awarding plaintiff alimony that was not modifiable in duration or amount; whether trial court improperly failed to consider or give significant weight to certain factors, including defendant's age, health and future earning capacity, in awarding alimony; whether trial court improperly engaged in double counting by awarding plaintiff portion of value of defendant's businesses and by awarding plaintiff alimony that was based on defendant's income from those businesses.</i>	
Saunders v. KDFBS, LLC (Order), 338 C 915	133
State v. Michael T., 338 C 705	3
<i>Sexual assault first degree; risk of injury to child; prosecutorial impropriety; claim that prosecutor improperly relied on facts not in evidence by rephrasing testimony of minor victim, who was reluctant to testify; claim that, during closing and rebuttal arguments, prosecutor improperly argued facts not in evidence, appealed to the jurors' emotions, and vouched for victim's credibility by thanking jurors and apologizing to them for having to view evidence pertaining to sexual assault and by remarking on victim's character, emotions, and injuries; whether trial court was required, pursuant to statute (§ 54-84 (b)), to grant defense counsel's request to deviate from statutory language regarding defendant's "failure" to testify and to instruct jury that it may draw no adverse inference from fact that defendant "elected" not to testify; request to overrule State v. Casanova (255 Conn. 581); claim that § 54-84 (b) was unconstitutional insofar as it violated constitutional right to remain silent by referring to defendant's failure to testify.</i>	

(continued on next page)

State v. Pompei, 338 C 749 47
Interfering with officer; motion to suppress; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress certain evidence; whether defendant was seized within meaning of fourth amendment when police officer positioned his cruiser behind defendant's parked car and blocked his egress while defendant was unconscious or asleep in driver's seat; whether limited intrusion on defendant's liberty was justified by community caretaking exception to fourth amendment's warrant requirement.

State v. Porfil, 338 C 792 90
Possession of narcotics with intent to sell by person who is not drug-dependent; sale of narcotics within 1500 feet of school; possession of drug paraphernalia; possession of narcotics; interfering with officer; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that evidence of constructive possession was sufficient to sustain defendant's conviction of possession of narcotics and possession of narcotics with intent to sell by person who is not drug-dependent, when narcotics were found in common area over which defendant did not have exclusive possession; appeal dismissed on ground that certification was improvidently granted.

State v. Sinchak (Order), 338 C 914. 132
Volume 338 Cumulative Table of Cases 135

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Connolly v. State (See Menard v. State), 208 CA 303. 31A
In re Neveah D. (Memorandum Decision), 208 CA 904. 92A
Menard v. State, 208 CA 303 31A
Underinsured motorist benefits; whether plaintiffs' original joint appeal was taken from final judgments; whether this court lacked subject matter jurisdiction to entertain original joint appeal; claim that trial court improperly declined to award plaintiffs damages related to claims of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD); whether PTSD claims were compensable under underinsured motorist claims statute (§ 38a-336); whether PTSD and accompanying physical manifestations could be construed as "bodily injury" within purview of § 38a-336; claim that trial court improperly reduced plaintiffs' damages by sums of workers' compensation benefits received; whether statutory and regulatory scheme governing underinsured motorist coverage in Connecticut imposed requirement on self-insurers to notify claimants of election of permissive offsets under applicable state regulation (§ 38a-334-6); claim that trial court committed error in declining to reduce one plaintiff's damages by sums recovered pursuant to Dram Shop Act (§ 30-102); whether plaintiff was compensated twice for same injury in violation of common-law rule precluding double recovery; whether, on remand, because plaintiffs were not entitled to recover damages against state, judgments must be rendered for state.

Orzech v. Giacco Oil Co., 208 CA 275. 3A
Workers' compensation; claim that Compensation Review Board improperly affirmed Workers' Compensation Commissioner's award of survivorship benefits to plain-

(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.

tiff; whether commissioner erred in making several subordinate findings supporting his determination that chain of causation connecting decedent's compensable injuries to his death existed; whether commissioner improperly failed to find that decedent's conduct leading up to his death constituted superseding cause of his death that defeated compensability pursuant to Sapko v. State (305 Conn. 360).

S. B-R. v. J. D., 208 CA 342. 70A

Order of civil protection; whether trial court abused its discretion in issuing order of civil protection pursuant to statute (§ 46b-16a); claim that trial court did not apply objective standard in finding that plaintiff's fear was reasonable; claim that trial court failed to make finding that defendant would continue to commit acts of stalking against plaintiff.

Setzer v. Gugliotti (Memorandum Decision), 208 CA 903 91A

U.S. Bank Trust, N.A. v. Healey (Memorandum Decision), 208 CA 903 91A

Zdrojeski v. State (See Menard v. State), 208 CA 303 31A

Volume 208 Cumulative Table of Cases 93A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASE

Summaries 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Authorized House Counsel 1C

Notice of Suspension of Attorney and Appointment of Trustee. 1C

Advisory Opinion No. 2021-3. 3C

Notice of Public Hearing on Proposed Revisions to Probate Court Rules of Procedure. 8C