

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 29 January 18, 2022 213 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Benjamin F. v. Dept. of Developmental Services (Order), 340 C 921	57
Coltherst v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 340 C 920	56
Connolly v. State (Order) (See Menard v. State), 340 C 916.	52
Cruz v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 340 C 913.	49
Gutierrez v. Mosor (Order), 340 C 913	49
Hartford Police Dept. v. Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities (Orders), 340 C 919, 920	55, 56
High Watch Recovery Center, Inc. v. Dept. of Public Health (Order), 340 C 913	49
Idlibi v. Dept. of Children & Families (Order), 340 C 918	54
Krahel v. Czoch (Order), 340 C 918	54
Menard v. State (Order), 340 C 916	52
Mobley v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 340 C 914	50
New Haven v. 20 Gerrish Avenue, LLC (Order), 340 C 918	54
Not Another Power Plant v. Connecticut Siting Council, 340 C 762	2
<i>Application for certificate of environmental compatibility and public need pursuant to provision (§ 16-50k (a)) of Public Utility Environmental Standards Act; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's appeal from decision of defendant siting council approving application of defendant energy company to construct electric generating facility; claim that plaintiff nonprofit environmental conservation association lacked standing to appeal from council's decision pursuant to statute (§ 22a-19 (a) (1)) for failure to raise colorable claim of unreasonable impairment or destruction of environment; claim that council's refusal to consider environmen- tal impact of upgrading nonparty's gas pipeline during proceedings on defendant energy company's application for electric generating facility was arbitrary and capricious; claim that council improperly segmented project into two separate components in order to avoid comprehensive review of project's overall impact; whether plaintiff waived its claim regarding council's refusal to consider environ- mental impact of upgraded pipeline; whether council, in determining whether facility under review will have public benefit, was prohibited under Public Utility Environmental Standards Act from considering facts that facility under review is interdependent with another facility that did not yet exist and that there was significant likelihood that nonexistent facility ultimately might not be approved because its harmful effects, considered together with harmful effects of facility under review, could outweigh public benefit of facilities considered as whole; claim that trial court failed to recognize that upgraded pipeline could evade council's review; claim that trial court's failure to recognize that, under § 16-50k (a), nonparty owner of gas pipeline could file with council petition for declaratory ruling that upgraded pipeline would not have substantial adverse environmental effect rather than apply for certificate of environmental compatibility and pub- lic need.</i>	
Robinson v. Tindill (Order), 340 C 917	53
Santana v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 340 C 920	56
State v. Cowan (Order), 340 C 919	55
State v. Espinal (Order), 340 C 916	52
State v. Luna (Order), 340 C 917	53
Strazza Building & Construction, Inc. v. Harris (Order), 340 C 915.	51

(continued on next page)

Swain v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 340 C 916 52
 Torres v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 340 C 921. 57
 Volume 340 Cumulative Table of Cases 59

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Berka v. Waterbury (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 901 135A
 Marshall v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles, 210 CA 109 111A
Administrative appeal; suspension of motor vehicle operator's license by defendant Commissioner of Motor Vehicles pursuant to statute (§ 14-227b); claim that trial court improperly concluded that Department of Motor Vehicles hearing officer did not abuse her discretion by admitting certain exhibit into evidence; whether arresting officer's failure to mail report of incident to department within three business days of plaintiff's arrest as required by § 14-227b (c) rendered it unreliable.
 MTGLQ Investors, L.P. v. Lakner (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 901. 135A
 Poce v. O & G Industries, Inc., 210 CA 82 84A
Negligence; infliction of emotional distress; premises liability; recklessness; whether trial court erred in granting in part defendant's motion to strike; whether trial court erred in granting defendant's motion for summary judgment; adoption of trial court's memoranda of decision as proper statements of relevant facts and analyses of applicable law on issues.
 Salce v. Cardello, 210 CA 66 68A
Probate appeal; trusts; claim that defendant violated in terrorem clauses contained in will and trust agreement; whether defendant filed creditor's claim against estate in violation of in terrorem clauses contained in will and trust agreement; whether in terrorem clauses prohibiting beneficiaries of will and trust from challenging any action taken by fiduciary were unenforceable as matter of public policy.
 State v. LaMotte, 210 CA 44 46A
Robbery in first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion by not affording defendant evidentiary hearing on motion to withdraw guilty pleas; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to pursue alibi defense; claim that defendant was under duress during plea proceeding because state's inspector had coerced and given false information about defendant to witness who was to testify at defendant's trial.
 State v. McCarthy, 210 CA 1 3A
Kidnapping in second degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in second degree; larceny in second degree; claim that defendant was entitled to new trial because trial court improperly failed to provide jury with incidental restraint instruction in accordance with State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509); claim that there was insufficient evidence to support conviction of kidnapping in second degree; claim that state failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt that defendant intended to prevent liberation of victims beyond that which was incidental to and necessary to commit larceny and that he used or threatened to use physical force or intimidation to

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.

(continued on next page)

restrain his victims; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to due process and abused its discretion by denying his requests to remove his leg shackles at trial.

Volume 210 Cumulative Table of Cases 137A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASE

Summaries 1B

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Notice of Declaratory Ruling Proceeding. 1C
DSS—Notice of Intent to Submit Emergency Preparedness and Response Amendment. 2C

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel 1D
Notice of Reprimand of Attorneys 1D
