

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIV No. 3

July 19, 2022

253 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Costanzo v. Plainfield, 344 C 86	42
<i>Action against defendant town and defendant town employees to recover damages for drowning in pool on private property; allegations that defendants issued building permit for pool prior to inspecting it to ensure that safety features required by state building code were installed; certification from Appellate Court; whether trial court's orders sustaining plaintiff's objections to defendants' apportionment complaint and notice of intent to seek apportionment constituted final judgment permitting interlocutory appellate review; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had improperly sustained plaintiff's objections to defendants' apportionment complaint and notice of intent to seek apportionment; whether plaintiff's allegations fell within first exception to municipal immunity in statute (§ 52-557n (b) (8)) that subjects municipality to liability for injuries that occur as result of failure to inspect or inadequate or negligent inspection of property to determine whether property complies with or violates any law or contains health or safety hazard when municipality had notice of such violation of law or such hazard; whether plaintiff's allegations fell within purview of statute (§ 52-572h (o)) permitting liability to be apportioned among parties liable for negligence in any cause of action created by statute based on negligence.</i>	
Garcia v. Cohen, 344 C 84	40
<i>Negligence; premises liability; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had committed reversible error by failing to instruct jury on nondelegable duty doctrine; appeal dismissed on ground that certification was improvidently granted.</i>	
International Investors v. Town Plan & Zoning Commission, 344 C 46	2
<i>Zoning; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that defendant plan and zoning commission was authorized by statute (§ 8-2 (a)) to condition approval of special permit on completion of development within specified time period and that special permit approval expired two years after its effective date because construction had not yet been completed; whether commission lacked authority to condition continuing validity of special permit on completion of development within specified period of time that conflicted with time limitation prescribed by statute (§ 8-3) for satisfying the same condition.</i>	
Volume 344 Cumulative Table of Cases	71

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Budlong & Budlong, LLC v. Zakko, 213 CA 697	3A
<i>Contracts; claim that trial court improperly overruled defendant's objection to attorney fact finder's report; claim that trial court failed to review evidence considered by attorney fact finder; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment in accordance with attorney fact finder's report because report contained insufficient factual findings; whether claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment in accordance with report was properly preserved for appellate review.</i>	
Costas v. Commissioner of Revenue Services, 213 CA 719	25A
<i>Administrative tax appeal; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that defendant Commissioner of Revenue Services was entitled to summary judgment; claim that trial court and commissioner misinterpreted applicable state regulations (§§ 12-711(b)-17 (c) and 12-711(b)-18 (c)) in determining correct apportionment of</i>	

(continued on next page)

certain income between Connecticut and New York; claim that trial court incorrectly refused to require commissioner to exercise his discretionary authority under state regulation (§ 12-711(b)-15 (a)) to approve plaintiffs' proposed alternate apportionment methodology; whether plaintiffs failed to overcome presumption under § 12-711(b)-15 (b) that apportionment mandated by regulatory scheme was presumptively fair and equitable.

Ferri v. Powell-Ferri, 213 CA 841 147A
Vexatious litigation; whether trial court correctly concluded that defendant had probable cause to initiate and pursue cross complaint against plaintiff in prior action.

Mercedes-Benz Financial v. 1188 Stratford Avenue, LLC, 213 CA 739 45A
Breach of contract; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to open and to set aside default judgment; claim that trial court abused its discretion by denying defendants' oral motion to continue hearing on motion to open judgment.

State v. Garrison, 213 CA 786 92A
Assault in first degree; motion to suppress; whether trial court properly denied defendant's motion to suppress certain statements he made to police while in hospital because statements were product of custodial interrogation and police had not advised him of his rights pursuant to Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436); whether trial court properly determined that defendant was not in police custody for purposes of Miranda; whether officers' questioning of defendant constituted equivalent of interrogation for purposes of Miranda because officers should have known that questions reasonably were likely to elicit incriminating statements; claim that admission of defendant's statements into evidence was harmless beyond reasonable doubt.

State v. Greer, 213 CA 757 63A
Risk of injury to child; sexual assault in second degree; statute of limitations; claim that trial court improperly concluded that statute of limitations applicable to charges of sexual assault in second degree under applicable statute ((Rev. to 2001) § 54-193a, as amended by Public Acts 2002, No. 02-138) did not apply to risk of injury charges even though charges were all based on defendant's same conduct; claim that trial court improperly declined to instruct jury to apply standard of proof to determine whether defendant committed prior acts of uncharged misconduct.

State v. Smith, 213 CA 848 154A
Kidnapping in first degree; felony murder; robbery in first degree; manslaughter in first degree; motion to correct illegal sentence; whether defendant's claim that his convictions for felony murder and manslaughter, after he had been acquitted of both capital felony and murder in same proceeding, violated constitutional prohibition against double jeopardy attacked proceedings leading up to convictions instead of sentence or sentence proceeding; whether trial court abused its discretion in sentencing defendant on his felony murder conviction rather than on his manslaughter conviction.

Volume 213 Cumulative Table of Cases 165A

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

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.

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B