

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIV No. 12 September 20, 2022 269 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Clinton v. Aspinwall, 344 C 696	2
<i>Breach of contract; breach of fiduciary duty; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over defendants' appeals to that court; whether defendants appealed from final judgment; whether plaintiff's breach of contract and fiduciary duty claims were legally inconsistent under Delaware law.</i>	
State v. Flores, 344 C 713.	19
<i>Home invasion; burglary first degree; attempt to commit robbery first degree; conspiracy to commit home invasion; whether trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to suppress written statement that he had given to police; claim that trial court's finding that defendant offered to make statement unprompted by police was clearly erroneous; claim that failure of police to preserve recording of encounter in which defendant provided police with statement rendered statement inadmissible pursuant to statute (§ 54-1o) governing admissibility of statements made in course of unrecorded custodial interrogation at place of detention; whether state overcame presumption of inadmissibility under § 54-1o by establishing, by preponderance of evidence, that defendant's statement was voluntary and reliable; whether trial court improperly admitted into evidence written cooperation agreement between state and coconspirator; whether provisions of cooperation agreement obligating witness to testify truthfully constituted improper vouching by state, either as evidentiary matter or as matter of prosecutorial impropriety; whether evidence was insufficient to support defendant's conviction of attempt to commit robbery first degree, burglary first degree, and conspiracy to commit home invasion.</i>	
Volume 344 Cumulative Table of Cases	83

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Ayuso v. Commissioner of Correction, 215 CA 322	90A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly denied petition for writ of habeas corpus; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether petitioner was deprived of right to due process when prosecutor failed to correct testimony concerning bulletproof vest worn by police officer during shooting incident with petitioner; claim that petitioner was prejudiced by trial counsel's decision not to challenge state's evidence that bullet caused officer's injury; claim that reasonable probability existed that outcome of criminal trial would have been different if petitioner's trial counsel had investigated and presented certain evidence in support of self-defense claim; whether petitioner's trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to raise claim under State v. Morales (232 Conn. 707) regarding state's failure to preserve certain evidence at trial; claim that petitioner's appellate counsel rendered deficient performance by failing to challenge certain of trial court's actions concerning witness who purportedly threatened petitioner on day of shooting incident; claim that appellate counsel rendered deficient performance by failing to raise Morales claim concerning state's failure to preserve vehicle police officers occupied during shooting incident; claim that appellate counsel rendered deficient performance by failing to raise unpreserved claim that prosecutor improperly vouched for credibility of police officer during closing argument to jury; claim that habeas court improperly</i>	

(continued on next page)

	<i>precluded petitioner's habeas counsel from questioning trial prosecutor about whether prosecutor should have known at time of trial that certain of police officer's testimony was false.</i>	
Disciplinary Counsel v. Spadoni, 215 CA 249		17A
	<i>Attorney misconduct; application for reinstatement to bar; whether trial court improperly accepted recommendation of Standing Committee on Recommendations for Admission to Bar for New Haven County that defendant's application for reinstatement be denied; whether standing committee, in making its recommendation, abused its discretion or acted arbitrarily, unreasonably, or without fair investigation of facts; claim that standing committee exceeded scope of its investigative authority by inquiring as to defendant's presuspension misconduct; claim that standing committee improperly found that defendant failed to accept his obstruction of justice conviction with sincerity and honesty.</i>	
Karagozian v. MyEyeDr. Optometry of Connecticut, LLC (Memorandum Decision), 215 CA 901		155A
Lehane v. Murray, 215 CA 305		73A
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion to modify custody of minor child; whether trial court improperly delegated judicial authority to nonjudicial party when it permitted defendant to alter, change or modify plaintiff's visitation schedule with child; claim that trial court abused its discretion in ordering plaintiff to undergo psychological evaluation in violation of statute (§ 46b-6); whether trial court erred in modifying dissolution judgment to permit defendant to claim minor child as dependent for income tax purposes when parties' separation agreement, which was incorporated into dissolution judgment, gave plaintiff nonmodifiable right to claim child as dependent.</i>	
State v. Gamer, 215 CA 234		2A
	<i>Violation of probation; claim that evidence was insufficient to establish that defendant wilfully failed to pay restitution that was special condition of his probation; claim that trial court abused its discretion in revoking defendant's probation and sentencing him to term of incarceration.</i>	
State v. White, 215 CA 273		41A
	<i>Assault in first degree with firearm as accessory; jury instructions; claim that evidence was insufficient to support conviction where defendant's actions did not show he intended to physically harm victim or intended that his accomplice would use firearm in commission of offense; whether trial court properly declined to instruct jury that elements of accessorial liability pursuant to statute (§ 53a-8) required that defendant had to intend or to know that principal would discharge firearm during commission of assault in first degree; claim that this court should overrule precedent holding that accomplice need not have knowledge of or intent regarding aggravating factor that requires that principal have only general intent.</i>	
Volume 215 Cumulative Table of Cases		157A

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

JOSEPH DIBENEDETTO, *Publications Deputy 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.

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

NOTICE OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Notice of Merger and Continued Assignment of Cases from Superior Court Geographical Area 1C

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Application for Reinstatement 1D
Notice of Authorized House Counsel 1D
