

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXII No. 34

February 23, 2021

256 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Chemtura Corp., 336 C 194	3
<i>Breach of contract; whether trial court properly rendered judgment for defendant on claim alleging breach of commercial contract governed by New York law when plaintiff failed to strictly comply with notice provision; whether New York law requires strict compliance with notice provision of commercial contract when other party to contract receives actual notice and is not prejudiced by lack of strict compliance.</i>	
In re Josiah D. (Order), 336 C 915	29
Kaminski v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 336 C 915	29
Volume 336 Cumulative Table of Cases	31

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Collins v. Commissioner of Correction, 202 CA 789	163A
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner was denied constitutional right to counsel free from conflict of interest; whether conflict of interest claim was procedurally defaulted; claim that trial counsel had financial incentive not to retain expert witnesses because petitioner and his family were unable to pay costs of same; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to investigate or present testimony of potential eyewitness.</i>	
Commissioner of Public Health v. Colandrea, 202 CA 815	189A
<i>Petition to enforce subpoena duces tecum seeking production of patient records from defendant dentist; whether trial court abused its discretion by finding that defendant's noncompliance with subpoena was wilful; whether trial court abused its discretion by awarding attorney's fees to plaintiff pursuant to statute (§ 52-256b (a)); reviewability of claim that trial court's order permitting plaintiff to search defendant's office violated fourth amendment to United States constitution.</i>	
DeLeo v. Equale & Cirone, LLP, 202 CA 650	24A
<i>Breach of fiduciary duty; whether trial court's subordinate findings of fact regarding noncompete provision in partnership agreement were clearly erroneous; claim that trial court should not have invalidated noncompete provision because parties had equal bargaining power and entered into partnership agreement voluntarily; whether trial court properly concluded that noncompete provision in partnership agreement was not enforceable as unreasonable restraint of trade.</i>	
Fronsaglia v. Fronsaglia, 202 CA 769	143A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; financial orders; claim that trial court abused its discretion in issuing its financial orders by making grossly disproportionate property distribution in plaintiff's favor and assigning majority of marital debt to defendant; whether there was sufficient evidence to support trial court's finding as to defendant's actual earnings; claim that trial court erred by basing its alimony award solely on defendant's gross income rather than on his net income; claim that trial court abused its discretion by awarding alimony to plaintiff to punish defendant for his purported misdeeds.</i>	
Godfrey v. Commissioner of Correction, 202 CA 684	58A
<i>Habeas corpus; murder; death penalty; frustration of purpose doctrine; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner was not entitled to habeas relief with respect to collateral attack on guilty plea because he failed to prove that principal purpose for entering into guilty plea with agreed on sixty year sentence</i>	

(continued on next page)

<i>was substantially frustrated by subsequent abolition of death penalty and that he had assumed risk that law might change in his favor; whether petitioner was fully aware of consequences of his plea; whether terms of plea agreement were ambiguous; amelioration doctrine, discussed.</i>	
In re Kameron N. (AC 44079), 202 CA 628	2A
<i>Termination of parental rights; claim that Indian tribe, of which respondent father was member, did not receive adequate notice of termination of parental rights proceeding in violation of Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. § 1901 et seq.).</i>	
In re Kameron N. (AC 44086), 202 CA 637	11A
<i>Termination of parental rights; claim that notice to Indian tribe of involuntary nature of termination of parental rights proceedings was inadequate, in violation of Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. § 1901 et seq.); whether trial court abused its discretion by denying motion to open evidence; whether trial court's determination that termination of respondent mother's parental rights was in child's best interest was clearly erroneous.</i>	
Madigan v. Columbia Dental, P.C. (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 907	203A
Morales v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 906	202A
Morganti Group, Inc. v. Concrete Superstructures, Inc. (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 906	202A
MSW Associates, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Dept., 202 CA 707	81A
<i>Zoning; whether trial court erred by holding that zoning regulations' limitation of solid waste facilities only to those in certain zone and in existence as of certain date violated statute (§ 22a-208b (b)) barring zoning laws from prohibiting construction, alteration or operation of any type of solid waste facility; whether plaintiff lacked standing to claim violation of § 22a-208b (b).</i>	
Sauve v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 906	202A
State v. Sayles, 202 CA 736.	110A
<i>Felony murder; conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; carrying pistol without permit; motion to suppress; whether trial court improperly denied motion to suppress evidence obtained from defendant's cell phone; claim that evidence from cell phone was discovered as result of violation of Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436); request that this court adopt prophylactic rule under state constitution that would render inadmissible incriminating evidence obtained after criminal suspect invokes right to counsel or to have counsel present and police continue to use deceptive tactics to undermine those rights; whether trial court erred in concluding that police had probable cause to seize cell phone at police station pursuant to exigent circumstances exception to fourth amendment's warrant requirement; claim that police should not have relied on informant's self-serving statements to establish probable cause to search cell phone; reviewability of claim that warrant application to search cell phone contained materially false information pursuant to Franks v. Delaware (438 U.S. 154).</i>	
Taber v. Taber (Memorandum Decision), 202 CA 907	203A
Volume 202 Cumulative Table of Cases	205A

(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.

CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK

Notice of Correction—Rules for Superior Court 1PB

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

DSS—Notices of Proposed Medicaid SPA 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Authorized House Counsel 1C
Notice of Application for Reinstatement 1C
CT Bar Examining Committee—Notices of Application 2C
