

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIV No. 9

August 30, 2022

307 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Daley v. Kashmanian, 344 C 464	2
<i>Negligence; governmental immunity; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that common law and statute (§ 52-557n) conferred governmental immunity from liability for damages arising from personal injuries caused by police officer's negligent operation of motor vehicle while performing surveillance; whether trial court properly granted defendants' motion to set aside verdict in connection with plaintiff's negligence claim; whether operation of unmarked police vehicle, including following statutory rules of road, was ministerial function; whether legislature intended negligence in operation of motor vehicle to be shielded by governmental immunity.</i>	
State v. Freeman, 344 C 503	41
<i>Robbery first degree; plea of nolo contendere; motion to dismiss; claim that prosecution was barred by applicable five year statute of limitations ((Rev. to 2017) § 54-193 (b)); certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that there was sufficient evidence to establish that state had made reasonable efforts to serve arrest warrant before statute of limitations expired and that delay in service of warrant was reasonable; whether prosecutor's representations of fact to trial court constituted evidence that could serve to satisfy state's obligation to prove reasonableness of efforts to execute warrant.</i>	
State v. Hinds, 344 C 541	79
<i>Murder; carrying dangerous weapon; prosecutorial impropriety; claim that defendant was deprived of his due process right to fair trial as result of prosecutorial impropriety during prosecutor's closing and rebuttal arguments; whether prosecutor improperly referred to facts not in evidence and vouched for witness' credibility during closing argument in stating that jury could infer that witness' prior statements to police, which were not before jury, were consistent with his trial testimony; whether prosecutor improperly diluted state's burden of proof by referring to principle of Occam's razor during rebuttal argument; whether alleged improprieties deprived defendant of fair trial.</i>	
Volume 344 Cumulative Table of Cases	105

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Fairlake Capital, LLC v. Lathouris, 214 CA 750	148A
<i>Motion to discharge notice of lis pendens; motion to terminate stay; subject matter jurisdiction; final judgment; whether trial court's denial of motion to discharge notice of lis pendens was appealable final judgment pursuant to statute (§ 52-325c (a)); whether trial court abused its discretion in relying on discretionary stay of proceedings to decline to conduct statutorily (§§ 52-325a and 52-325b) required hearing to adjudicate merits of motion to discharge notice of lis pendens; whether trial court improperly denied motion to discharge notice of lis pendens without conducting hearing and making findings pursuant to §§ 52-325a and 52-325b.</i>	
In re Delilah G., 214 CA 604	2A
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court properly granted petition by petitioner father to terminate respondent mother's parental rights as to minor child; whether trial court properly determined that, pursuant to statute (§ 45a-717 (g) (2) (C)), no ongoing parent-child relationship existed between mother</i>	

(continued on next page)

and child; whether cumulative effect of evidence was sufficient to justify trial court's determinations that child had no present, positive feelings toward or memories of mother; whether trial court properly determined that mother failed to establish that father's actions rendered inevitable her lack of ongoing parent-child relationship with child; claim that certain court order effectively barred mother from visiting with child; whether evidence was sufficient to support trial court's conclusion that allowing further time for reestablishment of parent-child relationship between child and mother would be detrimental to child's best interests.

Konover Development Corp. v. Waterbury Omega, LLC, 214 CA 648. 46A

Breach of contract; prejudgment remedy; claim that trial court improperly granted application for prejudgment remedy; claim that trial court improperly concluded that plaintiff had established probable cause that defendant had breached oral agreement relating to plaintiff's management of rooftop wireless telecommunications agreements on behalf of defendant; whether enforcement of oral management agreement was barred by statute (§ 20-325a), rule against perpetuities, or statute of frauds.

Lending Home Funding Corp. v. REI Holdings, LLC, 214 CA 703. 101A

Foreclosure; whether trial court erred in determining it was without subject matter jurisdiction to hear motion to open and vacate judgment of strict foreclosure; whether timely filed motion to reargue or to reconsider trial court's denial of motion to open and vacate foreclosure judgment triggered automatic stay provision in applicable rule of practice (§ 61-11 (a)) until parties received notice of court's ruling on motion to reargue, thereby rendering law day that fell within extended appeal period without legal effect.

Mention v. Kensington Square Apartments, 214 CA 720 118A

Housing code enforcement; whether trial court had subject matter jurisdiction over evidence of housing code violations that predated filing of complaint; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant violated housing code; whether housing code, as applied to defendant, was unconstitutionally vague; claim that defendant failed to exhaust administrative remedies; claim that defendant failed to meet its burden for review of unpreserved claim pursuant to State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233); whether trial court erred in calculating amount of rent abatement due to plaintiff based on her share of subsidized rent.

State v. Sweet, 214 CA 679. 77A

Larceny in third degree; identify theft in third degree; persistent serious felony offender; claim that evidence was insufficient to prove that defendant appropriated in excess of \$2000 to himself; unpreserved claim that property report created by investigating police officer and victim's statement to police were improperly admitted into evidence in violation of sixth amendment right to confrontation; unpreserved claim that letters from two credit card issuers regarding fraudulent charges, which were admitted as past recollections recorded under provision (§ 8-3 (6)) of Connecticut Code of Evidence, constituted testimonial hearsay that was admitted in violation of sixth amendment right to confrontation; claim that statements of card issuers were improperly admitted into evidence as past recollections

(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

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.

recorded because information contained therein was not personally known to victim, through whom statements were presented. 185A

Volume 214 Cumulative Table of Cases 185A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

NOTICE OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

DSS—Notice of Intent to Renew IFS Waiver, Amend EDS and Comp Waiver 1C

Notice of Intent to Amend Connecticut Green Bank C-PACE Program Guidelines. 2C
