

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 49 June 7, 2022 369 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Cooke v. Williams (Order), 343 C 919	77
Dept. of Public Health v. Estrada (Order), 343 C 921.	79
Gawlik v. Malloy (Order), 343 C 919	77
Gleason v. Durden (Order), 343 C 921	79
Glover v. Bausch & Lomb, Inc., 343 C 513	21
<i>Claims under failure to warn provision of Connecticut Product Liability Act (CPLA) (§ 52-572q) and Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); appeal from judgment of United States District Court for District of Connecticut dismissing plaintiffs' complaint to United States Court of Appeals for Second Circuit; certification of questions of law from Second Circuit; whether cause of action exists under failure to warn provision of CPLA based on manufacturer's alleged failure to report adverse events to federal regulator, such as federal Food and Drug Administration; whether exclusivity provision (§ 52-572n) of CPLA bars claim under CUTPA based on allegations that manufacturer deceptively and aggressively marketed and promoted product despite knowing that it presented substantial risk of injury.</i>	
Gonzalez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 343 C 922	80
Jones v. Law Offices of William S. Palmieri, LLC (Order), 343 C 920	78
Kaufman v. Synnott (Order), 343 C 923	81
Newtown v. Gaydosh (Order), 343 C 920.	78
Quint v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 343 C 922	80
State v. Alexander, 343 C 495	3
<i>Felony murder; attempt to commit robbery first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery first degree; carrying pistol without permit; claim that trial court improperly denied motion for new trial with respect to certain offenses of which the defendant had been convicted; whether defendant's statements during police interrogation improperly were admitted into evidence because police continued to question him after he made equivocal statement that arguably could be construed as request for counsel; whether improper admission of statements made during interrogation was harmless beyond reasonable doubt.</i>	
State v. Schlosser (Order), 343 C 923.	81
State v. Tony O. (Order), 343 C 921.	79
Volume 343 Cumulative Table of Cases	83

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Apex Properties, LLC v. Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. (Memorandum Decision), 212 CA 902	80A
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Davis (See Apex Properties, LLC v. Deutsche Bank National Trust Co.) (Memorandum Decision), 212 CA 902	80A
Kinity v. US Bancorp, 212 CA 791.	3A
<i>Accidental failure of suit statute (§ 52-592); continuing course of conduct doctrine; motion for summary judgment; motion to enforce settlement agreement; claim that trial court erred in granting defendant insurance company's motion to enforce settlement agreement; whether trial court properly exercised its authority under Audubon Parking Associates Ltd. Partnership v. Barclay & Stubbs, Inc. (225 Conn. 804) to enforce settlement agreement; whether, under Waldman v. Beck (101 Conn. App. 669), trial court had authority to order precise form of relief agreed to by</i>	

(continued on next page)

<i>parties in settlement agreement; whether trial court properly concluded that clear, unambiguous, and enforceable agreement had been reached between plaintiff and defendant; whether trial court erred in finding settlement agreement was supported by valid consideration; claim that trial court improperly granted defendant bank's motion for summary judgment; whether trial court erred in concluding that § 52-592 was inapplicable and could not save plaintiff's otherwise untimely claims; whether trial court improperly concluded that continuing course of conduct doctrine was inapplicable to plaintiff's claims and could not toll applicable statutes of limitations; whether defendant bank owed continuing duty to plaintiff through special relationship between parties; whether trial court improperly concluded that plaintiff's claim of breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing failed as matter of law; whether defendant bank acted in bad faith.</i>	
Volume 212 Cumulative Table of Cases	81A
Barclays Bank Delaware v. Bamford, 213 CA 1	89A
<i>Debt collection action; motion to disqualify; motion for default for failure to disclose defense pursuant to rule of practice (§ 13-19); whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to disqualify trial judge on basis of impropriety; claim that defendant had no obligation to disclose defense pursuant to Practice Book § 13-19; whether trial court properly admitted billing account statements pursuant to business records exception to hearsay rule.</i>	
Doe v. Board of Education, 213 CA 22	110A
<i>Negligence; recklessness; respondeat superior liability; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in granting defendants' motions for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly failed to view evidence in light most favorable to plaintiffs; whether trial court properly determined that defendant public school employees and board of education were protected by statutory (§ 10-222l) immunity with respect to negligence allegations premised on their failure to comply with safe school climate plan following reports of bullying; whether trial court properly determined that defendants were protected by governmental immunity pursuant to applicable statute (§ 52-557n (a) (2) (B)) with respect to negligence claims involving their discretionary acts taken in response to reports of bullying; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of individual defendants with respect to recklessness claim; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motions for summary judgment with respect to respondeat superior liability claim against town and its board of education; claim that trial court improperly granted motions for summary judgment with respect to claims alleging that superintendent of school and board of education retaliated against plaintiffs for reporting instances of bullying.</i>	
Dolan v. Dolan, 213 CA 112	200A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion to modify unallocated alimony and child support; whether trial court abused its discretion by modifying definition of "pre-tax compensation from employment" in parties' separation agreement; whether trial court's modification of term in separation agreement conflicted with Supreme Court's decision in Gay v. Gay (266 Conn. 641).</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.

Russbach v. Yanez-Ventura, 213 CA 77 165A
Uninsured motorist coverage; whether trial court improperly concluded that defendant insurance company's failure to comply with requirements of applicable statute (§ 38a-336 (a) (2)) was excused; claim that Frantz v. United States Fleet Leasing, Inc. (245 Conn. 727), Kinsey v. Pacific Employers Ins. Co. (277 Conn. 398), and McDonald v. National Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, PA (79 Conn. App. 800), created exception to statutory requirements of § 38a-336 (a) (2) for every case that involved commercial fleet or garage insurance policy; whether trial court improperly determined that automobile policy provided for standard, rather than conversion, uninsured motorist insurance coverage.

Sessa v. Reale, 213 CA 151 239A
Probate appeal; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that Superior Court had subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's probate appeal; whether Probate Court denied plaintiff's application to hear and decide rejected claim or decided merits of rejected claim underlying application; whether statute (§ 45a-364 (b)) required plaintiff to commence suit following Probate Court's denial of his application to hear and decide rejected claim rather than to file probate appeal; claim that Superior Court improperly granted motion to dismiss when defendant raised alleged failure to satisfy time requirement for filing suit under § 45a-364 (b) in motion to dismiss instead of by special defense.

Sokolovsky v. Mulholland, 213 CA 128 216A
Administrative appeal; discrimination; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that trial court erred in concluding that statutory (§ 46a-101) ninety day limitation period for commencing action in Superior Court pursuant to statute (§ 46a-100) was subject matter jurisdictional; claim that trial court improperly dismissed plaintiff's action; claim that trial court erred by not considering action commenced on date that plaintiff filed his application for waiver of fees; whether trial court erred in concluding that plaintiff was required to plead continuing course of conduct doctrine in his complaint.

Volume 213 Cumulative Table of Cases 253A

NOTICE OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Department of Housing 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Docket and Case Assignments for Supreme and Appellate courts for the 2022—2023 Court Year 1C
 Notice of Inactive Statuts of Attorney 4C
 Appointment of Trustee 4C
 DOCJ—Personnel Notices, State's Attorney's, State of CT. 5C
 Notice of Adoption of Revisions to the Probate Court Rules of Procedure 7C