

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 41

April 12, 2022

196 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Chugh v. Kalra, 342 C 815	47
<i>Breach of partnership agreement; breach of fiduciary duty; libel per se; compensatory damages; punitive damages; motion to set aside verdict; whether named plaintiff's claims were barred by federal compulsory counterclaim rule (Fed. R. Civ. P. 13 (a) (1)) on ground that they were compulsory counterclaims in related federal action; whether breach of partnership agreement and breach of fiduciary duty claims failed as matter of law under Karanian v. Maulucci (185 Conn. 320); claim that partnership that had been created ceased to exist when named plaintiff and named defendant incorporated certain entities; claim that trial court abused its discretion in admitting testimony of named plaintiff's expert on damages in connection with named plaintiff's libel per se claim; whether there was sufficient evidence to support expert's testimony as to certain lost profit.</i>	
Grant v. Commissioner of Correction, 342 C 771	3
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner entered plea to risk of injury to child and strangulation in third degree and opted not to proceed to trial on basis of trial counsel's ineffective assistance; claim that trial counsel failed to inquire about petitioner's immigration status and failed to properly advise him of immigration consequences of his plea; whether habeas court properly denied petitioner's habeas petition; whether petitioner failed to meet his burden of establishing that, but for trial counsel's allegedly deficient performance, there was reasonable probability that he would have rejected plea offer and proceeded to trial.</i>	
State v. Stephenson (Order), 342 C 912	88
State v. Tyus, 342 C 784	16
<i>Murder; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had not improperly joined for trial defendant's case with that of codefendant; claim that joinder was improper because certain admission by codefendant was not admissible in defendant's case under coconspirator exception to hearsay rule; claim that defendant's rights under fourth amendment to United States constitution were violated by virtue of admission of information regarding location of defendant's cell phone when that information was secured without warrant; whether admission of information regarding location of defendant's cell phone was harmless beyond reasonable doubt; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that defendant's right to confrontation was not violated when trial court allowed employee of state forensic laboratory to testify about findings of ballistics analyst with same laboratory who was unavailable to testify at defendant's trial; whether admission of testimony in violation of defendant's right to confrontation was harmless beyond reasonable doubt.</i>	
State v. Gore (replacement pages), 342 C 139-142	iii
Volume 342 Cumulative Table of Cases	91

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Electrical Contractors, Inc. v. 50 Morgan Hospitality Group, LLC, 211 CA 724	64A
<i>Breach of contract; breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; whether payment provision in construction contract was ambiguous; claim that contract provision was disfavored in Connecticut and in construction industry; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment on plaintiff's claims of breach of contract and breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Kling v. Hartford Casualty Ins. Co., 211 CA 708 48A
Breach of insurance contract; whether defendant insurance company had duty to defend its insured under business liability insurance policy in personal injury action alleging negligence; claim that defendant had duty to defend insured because auto exclusion language in insurance policy was ambiguous.

Leach v. Commissioner of Correction, 211 CA 663 3A
Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner's trial counsel did not provide ineffective assistance.

MEB Loan Trust IV v. Moore (Memorandum Decision), 211 CA 903 85A
Patterson v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 211 CA 904. 86A
Pistello-Jones v. Jones (Memorandum Decision), 211 CA 903. 85A
Rossova v. Charter Communications, LLC, 211 CA 676 16A
Wrongful termination; pregnancy discrimination; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion for judgment notwithstanding verdict; whether plaintiff established prima facie case of pregnancy discrimination; whether defendant's proffered reason for terminating plaintiff's employment was pretextual; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support claim that termination of employment was motivated by intentional discrimination; claim that trial court miscalculated plaintiff's damages.

Volume 211 Cumulative Table of Cases 87A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASE

Summaries 1B

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.