

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

---

VOL. LXXXII No. 30                      January 26, 2021                      167 Pages

---

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Kondjoua v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 336 C 907 . . . . .	5
Leonova v. Leonov (Order), 336 C 906 . . . . .	4
Schuler v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 336 C 905 . . . . .	3
State v. Freeman (Order), 336 C 907 . . . . .	5
State v. Knox (Orders), 336 C 905, 906 . . . . .	3, 4
Volume 336 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	7

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Thibodeau (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 903 . . . . .	137A
Belco v. 23 Fair Street Operations, LLC (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 905 . . . . .	139A
Davis v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 904 . . . . .	138A
HSBC Bank USA, National Assn. v. Hines (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 903 . . . . .	137A
Ingram v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 905 . . . . .	139A
Northeast Builders Supply & Home Centers, LLC v. RMM Consulting, LLC, 202 CA 315 . . . . .	3A
<i>Breach of contract; motion to strike; whether trial court properly granted plaintiff's motion to strike certain counts of defendant's counterclaim because those counts involved different set of facts distinct from those necessary to adjudicate sole issue in complaint; whether trial court's finding that plaintiff was seller of building materials was clearly erroneous; whether trial court's finding that individual defendants were buyers under credit agreement was clearly erroneous; whether trial court applied proper standard in analyzing defendants' defense of revocation; whether trial court misapplied provision (§ 42a-2-714) of Uniform Commercial Code; whether trial court's award of damages was clearly erroneous.</i>	
Roberts v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 904 . . . . .	138A
Rose v. Commissioner of Correction, 202 CA 436 . . . . .	124A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in dismissing petition for writ of habeas corpus for petitioner's failure to show good cause pursuant to statute (§ 52-470) for delay of more than one year in refiling petition that previously had been withdrawn; claim that habeas court's findings were clearly erroneous as to advice petitioner's counsel had provided about need to refile petition and relevant time limits as it related to refiling.</i>	
State v. Edwards, 202 CA 384 . . . . .	72A
<i>Burglary in first degree; robbery in first degree; conspiracy to commit larceny in first degree; assault in second degree; larceny in second degree; whether evidence was sufficient to support jury's finding that value of stolen property in defendant's possession exceeded \$10,000 as required by statute (§ 53a-123); whether victim's testimony on its own was sufficient to support jury's finding of value of property; whether evidence was sufficient to establish that defendant knew property in his possession was stolen; whether trial court improperly admitted hearsay testimony from police detective regarding surveillance video; whether defendant was harmed by admission of challenged testimony; whether trial court abused its discretion in precluding defense counsel from cross-examining victim about unrelated incident in which she was convicted of possession of narcotics; claim that trial court's jury instruction concerning reasonable doubt constituted structural error.</i>	
State v. Ferrazzano-Mazza, 202 CA 411 . . . . .	99A
<i>Operating motor vehicle while under influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs; operating motor vehicle without license; claim that trial court improperly excluded</i>	

(continued on next page)

*evidence that defendant had offered to take blood test in lieu of Breathalyzer test and gave jury limiting instruction that it could not consider her offer to take blood test as relevant to any issue in case; whether there was reasonable possibility that jury was misled by trial court's limiting instruction; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's request to charge jury on field sobriety acts; whether there was reasonable possibility that jury was misled by trial court's refusal to adopt defendant's requested instruction.*

State v. \$4137 in United States Currency (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 904 . . . . . 138A  
State v. Williams, 202 CA 355 . . . . . 43A

*Larceny in first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting certain reports into evidence pursuant to statutory (§ 52-180) business records exception to rule against hearsay; whether trial court abused its discretion in sustaining various evidentiary objections by state to certain documents and testimony that defendant proffered at trial; whether trial court abused its discretion by denying defendant's request for certificates pursuant to statute (§ 54-82i (c)) to subpoena out-of-state witnesses and by considering timeliness of defendant's request.*

Volume 202 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 141A

**SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES**

Summaries . . . . . 1B

**CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK**

Amendment to the Rules of Appellate Procedure . . . . . 1PB

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Bar Exam Committee—Notices of Application . . . . . 1C

**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.