

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 19 November 9, 2021 276 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Anthony A. v. Commissioner of Correction, 339 C 290	2
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that Department of Correction did not violate petitioner's constitutional right to procedural due process in classifying him as sex offender; whether petitioner was afforded all of procedural protections required by Wolff v. McDonnell (418 U.S. 539); whether there was sufficient evidence in record to support petitioner's classification as sex offender; claim that habeas court incorrectly concluded that department did not violate petitioner's state constitutional right to substantive due process by classifying him as sex offender; whether department's classification decision could withstand rational basis review; whether habeas court correctly concluded that petitioner's classification as sex offender on basis of nonconviction information did not violate article first, § 9, of Connecticut constitution.</i>	
Antonio A. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 339 C 909	117
Gibson v. Jefferson Woods Community, Inc. (Order), 339 C 911	119
Gonzalez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 339 C 909	117
Hasan v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 339 C 910	118
Holloway v. Carvalho (Order), 339 C 911	119
In re Karter F. (Order), 339 C 912.	120
State v. Alicea, 339 C 385.	97
<i>Assault first degree; claim that jury's verdict of guilty of intentional assault and reckless assault was legally inconsistent; claim that state could not maintain on appeal that defendant's convictions were consistent on ground that state's theory of case at trial contemplated charges of intentional and reckless assault as alternatives.</i>	
State v. Courtney G., 339 C 328	40
<i>First degree sexual assault; risk of injury to child; prosecutorial impropriety; whether trial court improperly admitted evidence of victim's out-of-court demeanor; whether prosecutor engaged in improprieties during closing and rebuttal arguments; claim that prosecutor's comment that defendant displayed "lack of outrage" at sexual abuse allegations violated his right to confrontation and improperly appealed to jurors' emotions and passions; whether prosecutor's comment that defendant displayed "lack of outrage" referred to defendant's testimonial demeanor or his courtroom demeanor unrelated to his demeanor while testifying; claim that prosecutor improperly diluted presumption of innocence and infringed on defendant's right to testify by referring to his interest in outcome of case; claim that prosecutor improperly expressed her personal opinion with respect to defendant's credibility by questioning inconsistencies in his testimony; claim that prosecutor's comments regarding victim's lack of motive to lie and testimonial demeanor were improper expressions of personal opinion; claim that prosecutor provided improper statement of law when she described reasonable doubt standard; whether prosecutor improperly mischaracterized evidence and risked diluting state's burden of proof by informing jury that victim's testimony was unchallenged and uncontroverted; whether prosecutorial improprieties deprived defendant of due process right to fair trial.</i>	
State v. Felimon C. (Order), 339 C 911	119
State v. Marshall (Order), 339 C 912	120
State v. Morlo M. (Order), 339 C 910	118

(continued on next page)

State v. Williams (Order), 339 C 910	118
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Booker (Order), 339 C 912	120
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Rothermel, 339 C 366	78
<i>Foreclosure; strict foreclosure; motion to open judgment; dismissal of appeal as moot; certification from Appellate Court; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that it was precluded by statute (§ 49-15) from opening judgment of strict foreclosure after law day had passed and title had become absolute in plaintiff bank; whether trial court had jurisdiction to open judgment of strict foreclosure when defendant raised equitable grounds involving alleged misrepresentations by plaintiff's loan servicer; whether Appellate Court properly dismissed defendant's appeal as moot in light of equitable nature of defendant's claims; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's motion to open judgment.</i>	
Volume 339 Cumulative Table of Cases	121

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Diaz v. Bridgeport, 208 CA 615	25A
<i>Workers' compensation; claim that Compensation Review Board improperly affirmed Workers' Compensation Commissioner's order granting plaintiff's request for commutation of certain disability benefits without instituting moratorium against payment of plaintiff's remaining benefits; whether board correctly concluded that commissioner's commutation order did not violate cap on heart and hypertension benefits pursuant to statute (§ 7-433b); whether commissioner's commutation order violated principles of equity, including prohibition against double recovery in workers' compensation system.</i>	
Freitag v. Commissioner of Correction, 208 CA 635	45A
<i>Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; whether habeas court improperly rejected petitioner's claim that trial counsel made misrepresentations to petitioner about whether codefendant was willing to testify at petitioner's criminal trial; claim that trial counsel failed to properly advise petitioner regarding potential defenses; whether habeas court improperly rejected claim that counsel at sentencing proceeding rendered ineffective assistance as result of failure to file motion to withdraw guilty pleas, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 39-27 (4)), on basis of trial counsel's ineffective assistance; whether habeas court properly concluded that counsel at sentencing proceeding presented adequate mitigation evidence.</i>	
Squillante v. Capital Region Development Authority, 208 CA 676.	86A
<i>Breach of contract; promissory estoppel; negligent misrepresentation; whether trial court erred in granting defendant's motions for summary judgment; adoption of trial court's memoranda of decision as proper statements of relevant facts and analyses of applicable law on issues.</i>	
State v. Cowan, 208 CA 710	120A
<i>Robbery in second degree; larceny in third degree; conspiracy to commit larceny in third degree; claim that defendant's due process rights were violated because his</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.

conviction was obtained on basis of false testimony, which state failed to correct; whether witness' testimony at defendant's trial was false; whether state improperly withheld impeachment evidence regarding witness' credibility.

State v. Michael F., 208 CA 663 73A

Assault in third degree; reckless endangerment in first degree; criminal violation of protective order; motions to open; whether trial court properly determined that it lacked jurisdiction to consider defendant's motions to open; claim that trial court abused its discretion when it failed to retain jurisdiction to determine motions to open; whether, as matter of law, there was jurisdiction for court to retain; whether allegation of ineffective assistance of counsel provided trial court with continuing jurisdiction over criminal case; claim that trial court violated defendant's right to due process when it dismissed motions to open without providing notice and opportunity to be heard on issue of jurisdiction; whether procedures used were adequate to prevent erroneous deprivation of defendant's private interest in exercising right to redress grievances.

State v. Suzanne P., 208 CA 592 2A

Operation of motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs; motion to modify condition of probation; claim that trial court improperly determined that special condition of probation prohibited defendant from having any contact with her children; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion for modification because special condition of probation violated her procedural and substantive due process rights.

Volume 208 Cumulative Table of Cases 131A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASE

Summaries 1B

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

CT Retirement Security Authority—Notice of Intent to Adopt Authority 1C

MISCELLANEOUS

Office of Chief Public Defender—Applications FY 2022/23 Annual Agreements 1D

Appointment of Trustee 4D

Notice of Reprimand of Attorney 4D