

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 47

May 24, 2022

215 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Centerplan Construction Co., LLC <i>v.</i> Hartford, 343 C 368	2
<i>Contract for construction of baseball stadium; breach of contract; counterclaim for breach of contract and breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing; whether plaintiff developer waived its right to contest errors by defendant city that occurred prior to execution of term sheet; whether city maintained control of and responsibility for stadium design and architectural firm's work from time that city contracted with plaintiffs until time that city assigned to plaintiffs its agreement with architectural firm; whether language in city's assignment of its agreement with architectural firm to plaintiffs plainly and unambiguously provided that plaintiffs had legal control of and responsibility for architectural firm and stadium design upon execution of that assignment until term sheet was executed; whether assignment's plain and unambiguous language established that city retained all obligations as to architectural firm arising out of architectural firm's services before assignment was executed; whether term sheet was unclear as to whether city or plaintiffs had control of architectural firm and stadium design after execution of term sheet until time that city terminated its contractual relationship with plaintiffs; whether term sheet unambiguously divested plaintiff builder of right, in its agreement with developer, to notice and opportunity to cure any default prior to termination.</i>	
Fenstermaker <i>v.</i> Fenstermaker (Order), 343 C 915	107
Gassesse <i>v.</i> University of Connecticut (Order), 343 C 914	106
J. K. <i>v.</i> M. G. (Order), 343 C 915	107
Kelsey <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction, 343 C 424	58
<i>Habeas corpus; certification from Appellate Court; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed successive petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed more than two years beyond limitation period set forth in statute (§ 52-470 (d) (1)) on ground that petitioner failed to establish good cause to overcome rebuttable presumption of unreasonable delay; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that habeas court's good cause determination is reviewed on appeal for abuse of discretion; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that habeas court did not abuse its discretion in finding that petitioner failed to establish good cause; whether lack of personal knowledge of law or change in law is relevant to good cause determination.</i>	
Mercado <i>v.</i> Castro-Cruz (Order), 343 C 913	105
MTGLQ Investors, L.P. <i>v.</i> Lakner (Order), 343 C 913	105
State <i>v.</i> Cusson (Order), 343 C 913	105
State <i>v.</i> Myers, 343 C 447	81
<i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; whether trial court properly dismissed in part and denied in part motions to correct illegal sentence filed by defendant, who was serving two distinct total effective sentences of eighteen years and fourteen years imprisonment for offenses he committed when he was under eighteen years of age; whether trial court properly dismissed claims that defendant was entitled to resentencing at which sentencing court would consider hallmark features of adolescence as mitigating factors pursuant to Miller <i>v.</i> Alabama (567 U.S. 460) and its progeny, and statute (§ 54-91g); claim that Board of Pardons and Paroles incorrectly determined defendant's parole eligibility date by basing its calculations on his shorter sentence, which resulted in later eligibility date; claim that board's incorrect parole eligibility calculation violated defendant's rights to due process</i>	

(continued on next page)

and equal protection; whether trial court properly denied claim that board's calculation of parole eligibility date violated defendant's right to due process; improper form of judgment.

State v. Siler (Order), 343 C 912	104
Tajay H. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 343 C 914	106
V. V. v. E. V. (Order), 343 C 915	107
State v. Patel (replacement pages), 343 C 465-466	v
Volume 343 Cumulative Table of Cases	109

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bennetta v. Derby, 212 CA 617	63A
<i>Public nuisance; motion to strike; claim that trial court erred in granting defendant city's motion to strike; whether complaint failed to allege that city created nuisance by some positive act as required by applicable statute (§ 52-557n (a) (1) (C)).</i>	
Board of Education v. Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities, 212 CA 578. . . .	24A
<i>Employment discrimination; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's appeal and affirmed decision of defendant Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities; claim that trial court improperly affirmed commission's award of back pay because award was not supported by substantial evidence; reviewability of claim that award of emotional distress damages was improper because commission was not authorized to award compensatory damages pursuant to statute (§ 46a-58) in employment discrimination cases that fall within scope of applicable statute (§ 46a-60); request that this court exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to review plaintiff's unpreserved claim in light of Supreme Court's decision in Connecticut Judicial Branch v. Gilbert (343 Conn. 90).</i>	
Gervais v. JACC Healthcare Center of Danielson, LLC (Memorandum Decision), 212 CA 902	86A
In re Marcquan C., 212 CA 564	10A
<i>Motion to revoke commitment; claim that trial court erred in finding that cause for commitment continued to exist.</i>	
In re Rabia K., 212 CA 556	2A
<i>Child neglect; mootness; whether appeal challenging trial court's decision adjudicating minor child neglected and committing minor child to custody and care of petitioner Commissioner of Children and Families was moot when, after appeal was filed, trial court granted minor child's motion to revoke commitment and thereby reunited child to mother's care; whether vacatur of trial court's judgment regarding adjudication of neglect was appropriate.</i>	
M. F. v. K. F. (Memorandum Decision), 212 CA 901	85A
Pishal v. Pishal, 212 CA 607	53A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion to modify alimony; whether trial court improperly relied on rule of practice (§ 15-8) in denying defendant's motion to modify alimony; claim that trial court improperly weighed evidence and applied incorrect legal standard; claim that trial court abused its discretion in declining to terminate</i>	

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.

(continued on next page)

alimony on basis of plaintiff's alleged cohabitation with third party or to modify alimony on basis of alleged substantial change in defendant's financial circumstances.

Sargent v. Casillo (Memorandum Decision), 212 CA 901 85A
 Speer v. New London Property Group Trust (Memorandum Decision), 212 CA 901 85A
 State v. Herman K., 212 CA 592 38A
Assault in first degree; carrying dangerous weapon; motion to recuse; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to recuse at his sentencing hearing; claim that sentencing judge was obligated to recuse himself when he learned from presentence investigation report of prior plea offer because there was appearance of partiality; claim that sentencing judge used wrong standard in resolving motion to recuse.

Willis W. v. Office of Adult Probation, 212 CA 628 74A
Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed petition for writ of habeas corpus for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that habeas court erred in declining to apply savings statute (§ 52-593a) to petition; claim that habeas court erred in concluding petitioner did not meet jurisdictional "in custody" requirement of statute (§ 52-466 (a)) despite fact that, at time he filed petition, he was being deprived of his liberty as result of two standing criminal protective orders.

Volume 212 Cumulative Table of Cases 87A

NOTICE OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIE

CT Paid Family & Medical Leave Insurance Authority 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

DOCJ—Personnel Notices, State's Attorney's, State of CT. 1C
 Bar Examining Committee 3C
 Notice of Suspension of Attorney 3C
 Notice of Inactive Status of Attorney 5C
 Notice of Pendency of Reinstatement Application 5C