

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 51

June 21, 2022

301 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Bova v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 343 C 928 | 138 |
| Fairlake Capital, LLC v. Lathouris (Order), 343 C 928 | 138 |
| In re Aisjaha N., 343 C 709 | 69 |
| <i>Motion for permanent legal guardianship; respondent mother's appeal from decision of trial court vesting permanent legal guardianship of minor child in her maternal grandmother after remote hearing on motion; reviewability of respondent mother's unpreserved claim that she was denied due process of law under fourteenth amendment to United States constitution by virtue of trial court's failure to ensure that she was present by two-way video technology at remote hearing; respondent mother's invitation for this court to exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to adopt rule requiring that trial court, before conducting virtual hearing or trial in child protection case, ensure that parties either appear by two-way videoconferencing technology or waive right to do so, after brief canvass.</i> | |
| In re Annessa J., 343 C 642. | 2 |
| <i>Termination of parental rights; trial on petition to terminate parental rights held remotely via Microsoft Teams; motions for posttermination visitation; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that respondent mother had failed to establish that she had fundamental right under article first, § 10, and article fifth, § 1, of Connecticut constitution to in person courtroom trial on petition to terminate her parental rights; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that record was inadequate to review respondent mother's unpreserved claim that she was denied right to physically confront witnesses against her at virtual termination of parental rights trial, in violation of due process clause of fourteenth amendment to United States constitution; whether Appellate Court improperly expanded standard set forth in this court's decision in In re Ava W. (336 Conn. 545) for deciding motions for posttermination visitation and improperly reversed trial court's rulings on respondents' motions for posttermination visitation on ground that trial court had failed to comply with that standard.</i> | |
| In re Vada V., 343 C 730 | 90 |
| <i>Termination of parental rights; claims that trial court violated respondents' rights under article first, § 10, and article fifth, § 1, of Connecticut constitution by conducting termination of parental rights trial virtually rather than in person; claims that respondents' were denied right to physically confront witnesses against them at virtual trial, in violation of due process clause of fourteenth amendment to United States constitution; claims under federal constitution or state and federal constitutions that state did not provide respondents with adequate devices and internet connection to participate both visually and by audio in termination proceeding.</i> | |
| Kaddah v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 343 C 928 | 138 |
| LendingHome Marketplace, LLC v. Traditions Oil Group, LLC (Order), 343 C 927 | 137 |
| Olorunfunmi v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 343 C 929 | 139 |
| Ortiz v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 343 C 927. | 137 |
| O'Sullivan v. Haught (Order), 343 C 930 | 140 |
| State v. Gray (Order), 343 C 929 | 139 |
| State v. Kyle A. (Order), 343 C 930 | 140 |
| State v. Rivera, 343 C 745 | 105 |
| <i>Murder; conspiracy to commit assault first degree; unlawful restraint first degree; unlawful discharge of firearm; carrying pistol or revolver without permit; certifi-</i> | |

(continued on next page)

cation from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had not abused its discretion in admitting into evidence DVD containing audio recording of defendant's alleged confession; claim that audio recording was inadequately authenticated and, therefore, was inadmissible under Connecticut Code of Evidence (§ 9-1); claim that unavailability of original recording rendered subsequent electronic copies of that recording inadmissible under best evidence rule; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had not abused its discretion when it directed jury to disregard portions of defense counsel's closing argument concerning prosecutor's failure to ask certain witness for in-court identification of defendant; whether any error on part of trial court was harmless.

Volume 343 Cumulative Table of Cases 141

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Highland Street Associates v. Commissioner of Transportation, 213 CA 426 122A
Declaratory judgment; action seeking declaratory judgment, pursuant to statute (§ 4-175), overturning decision of defendant Department of Transportation denying application for permission to replace existing support structure of highway billboard; whether trial court erred in concluding that replacement of billboard's existing support structure constituted maintenance and repair pursuant to Highway Beautification Act of 1965 (23 U.S.C. § 131 et seq.) and relevant state statute (§ 13a-123); claim that trial court's reliance on zoning statute (§ 8-2) was misplaced.

Milford v. Recycling, Inc., 213 CA 306 2A
Foreclosure; motion to open judgment of foreclosure; whether trial court abused its discretion by denying defendant's motion to open judgment of foreclosure; claim that trial court erred in concluding that balancing of equities relating to motion to open judgment of foreclosure and to extend sale date favored plaintiff.

Oral Care Dental Group II, LLC v. Pallet, 213 CA 389 85A
Administrative appeal; employment based sexual harassment and discrimination; claim that trial court erred when it vacated damages award granted by Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities' human rights referee to sexual harassment complainant after concluding that her former employer was prejudiced by her failure to produce certain of her medical records; whether complainant was required to disclose medical records to prove damages for garden-variety emotional distress.

Parrott v. Colon, 213 CA 375. 71A
Housing code enforcement; whether action for housing code enforcement brought pursuant to statute (§ 47a-14h) alleging breaches of lease in violation of statute (§ 47a-7) required plaintiffs to prove by fair preponderance of evidence that their allegations constituted violations of applicable housing code or materially affected health, safety, and habitability of premises.

(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.

Santiago v. Commissioner of Correction, 213 CA 358 54A
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying certification to appeal; claim that habeas court’s conclusion that petitioner was not denied effective assistance of trial counsel rested on clearly erroneous factual findings concerning trial counsel’s representations during sentencing proceeding; claim that habeas court erred in concluding that representation by petitioner’s trial counsel was not deficient and therefore that petitioner failed to satisfy performance prong of Strickland v. Washington (466 U.S. 668).

State v. Russaw, 213 CA 311 7A
Conspiracy to commit murder; unpreserved claim that defendant was deprived of right to due process because it is legally impossible to conspire to kill unintended victim; claim that state relied on doctrine of transferred intent for conspiracy charge; whether trial court improperly denied motion to suppress certain incriminating statements defendant made to police during custodial interrogation; whether trial court properly determined that defendant voluntarily and intelligently waived rights under Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436).

Swain v. Swain, 213 CA 411 107A
Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motion to modify custody, child support, visitation and parental access schedule; claim that trial court erred in modifying orders as to visitation, parental access plan and child support because defendant’s motion sought to modify only custody.

Szymonik v. Szymonik, 213 CA 421 117A
Dissolution of marriage; motion for contempt; motion for sanctions; whether trial court erred in granting motions for contempt; whether trial court erred in granting plaintiff’s motion for sanctions; whether trial court erred in awarding plaintiff attorney’s fees; whether trial court’s factual findings were clearly erroneous.

Volume 213 Cumulative Table of Cases 143A

MISCELLANEOUS

Bar Examining Committee. 1B
Docket and Case Assignments for Supreme and Appellate courts for the 2022—2023 Court Year. 3B