

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 33

February 15, 2022

471 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Fajardo v. Boston Scientific Corp., 341 C 535 . . . . .	29
<i>Product liability; lack of informed consent; innocent, negligent and intentional misrepresentation; claim under Connecticut Product Liability Act (§ 52-572m et seq.) that allegedly defective design of transvaginal mesh sling manufactured by named defendant caused named plaintiff to suffer personal injuries; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment for defendant gynecologist and defendant medical practice in connection with plaintiffs' claim that gynecologist failed to obtain patient's informed consent to sling procedure, when gynecologist recommended and advised named plaintiff regarding risks of that procedure but referred her to specialist, who ultimately performed procedure; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment for defendant gynecologist and defendant medical practice in connection with plaintiffs' misrepresentation claims; claim that trial court improperly declined to instruct jury on reasonable alternative design prong of risk-utility test for product liability claims alleging design defect.</i>	
Goguen v. Commissioner of Correction, 341 C 508 . . . . .	2
<i>Habeas corpus; sexual assault in second degree; whether Appellate Court properly dismissed self-represented petitioner's appeal because he failed to brief that habeas court had abused its discretion in denying his petition for certification to appeal; claim that sex offender registration requirement relating to expired conviction satisfied requirement under federal habeas corpus law that petitioner be in custody at time petition was filed.</i>	
Gonzalez v. O & G Industries, Inc., 341 C 644 . . . . .	138
<i>Negligence; personal injuries plaintiff employees sustained in explosion that occurred at natural gas fueled power plant as result of defendants' alleged negligence in connection with construction of that power plant and use of "gas blow" procedure; strict liability; abnormally dangerous activity; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment with respect to strict liability claims by concluding that gas blow procedure was not abnormally dangerous activity; whether totality of six factors in § 520 of Restatement (Second) of Torts established that gas blow procedure was not abnormally dangerous; claim that significant risk would remain even after precautions are employed given inherently dangerous attributes of natural gas; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motions for summary judgment with respect to plaintiffs' negligence claims; whether trial court correctly concluded that defendants did not exercise sufficient control over general contractor's or its subcontractors' performance of gas blow procedure to overcome general rule that employer is not vicariously liable for torts of its independent contractor; whether defendants exercised sufficient contractual control over gas blow procedure to establish existence of legal duty; claim that, even in absence of any contractual control, defendants in fact exercised control over gas blow procedures by assuming control or interfering with work; claim that defendants were vicariously liable for general contractor's negligence because general contractor was engaged in intrinsically dangerous activity, which satisfied distinct exception to general rule that employer is not liable for torts of its independent contractor; claim that plaintiffs' negligence claims survived summary judgment because defendants were directly negligent.</i>	
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Virgulak, 341 C 750 . . . . .	244
<i>Foreclosure; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's decision declining substitute plaintiff's request to reform mort-</i>	

(continued on next page)

*gage deed executed by defendant property owner to reference fact that it was given to secure note executed by defendant's husband; whether absence of finding by trial court that parties intended mortgage deed signed by defendant to secure note was clearly erroneous; claim that, because mortgage deed referenced note with same date and in same amount as note that defendant's husband signed, note must be note defendant agreed to secure when she executed mortgage deed; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's determination that substitute plaintiff was not entitled to foreclose mortgage because defendant was not borrower on note; claim that foreclosure was proper equitable relief on grounds that it was undisputed that defendant entered into mortgage transaction and common sense dictated that she intended her property interest to serve as security for note contemporaneously executed by defendant's husband.*

Klass v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co., 341 C 735 . . . . . 229

*Application to compel appraisal to resolve dispute between parties concerning claim under homeowners insurance policy; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's motion to reargue and reconsider; whether trial court improperly granted plaintiff's motion to compel appraisal; claim that dispute as to extent of insurer's replacement obligation pursuant to statute (§ 38a-316e (a)) was question of coverage to be resolved by court before insurance appraisal could proceed.*

Pfister v. Madison Beach Hotel, LLC, 341 C 702 . . . . . 196

*Zoning; permanent injunction; action seeking to enjoin defendants from hosting free outdoor concerts on strip of land in town park that was adjacent to property on which defendants' hotel was situated; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly applied plenary review to trial court's determination that hotel's use of park for concerts illegally expanded hotel's nonconforming use of hotel property; whether Crabtree Realty Co. v. Planning & Zoning Commission (82 Conn. App. 559) supported trial court's determination; whether trial court applied incorrect legal standard; claim that Appellate Court misapplied actual use doctrine in concluding that concerts were permitted use in park; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that town zoning regulations, which limited use of park to all active and passive recreational purposes, permitted holding of concerts in park.*

Riccio v. Bristol Hospital, Inc., 341 C 772 . . . . . 266

*Medical malpractice; accidental failure of suit statute (§ 52-592); claim that trial court erred in concluding that § 52-592 did not save plaintiff's otherwise time barred action because her first medical malpractice action was dismissed due to her attorney's gross negligence for failing to file legally sufficient medical opinion letters with her complaint; whether plaintiff met her burden of proving that her attorney's lack of knowledge of and failure to comply with Appellate Court opinions that established requirements for legally sufficient medical opinion letters was mistake, inadvertence or excusable neglect rather than egregious conduct or gross negligence.*

State v. Lopez, 341 C 793 . . . . . 287

*Violation of probation; whether evidence was sufficient to support trial court's finding that defendant, by possessing airsoft pellet gun, violated terms of his probation*

(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](http://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.

*prohibiting him from violating state or federal criminal laws and from possessing any firearm; claim that airsoft pellet gun could not be considered firearm within meaning of statute (§ 53a-3 (19)) that defines firearm as any weapon from which shot may be discharged.*

U.S. Bank, National Assn. v. Madison, 341 C 809 . . . . . 303  
*Foreclosure; bankruptcy; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court, in affirming trial court's judgment of strict foreclosure, improperly treated defense to foreclosure action as being same as claims and counterclaims, which are property of bankruptcy estate that must be disclosed in bankruptcy proceeding; appeal dismissed on ground that certification was improperly granted.*

Volume 341 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 309

**CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS**

Canner v. Governor's Ridge Assn., Inc., 210 CA 632 . . . . . 54A  
*Negligence; fraud; nuisance; fraudulent misrepresentation; breach of contract; violation of Common Interest Ownership Act (CIOA) (§ 47-200 et seq.); statute of limitations; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff's claims brought pursuant to CIOA were barred by three year tort statute of limitations codified in statute (§ 52-577); claim that trial court incorrectly determined that plaintiff's claims did not sound in contract and that § 52-577 was appropriate statute of limitations; whether trial court's factual findings and legal conclusions were sufficiently supported by record and were not clearly erroneous; whether closing date on which plaintiff came into possession of condominium unit with allegedly defective foundation was date on which statute of repose period began to run; whether trial court properly concluded that doctrine of equitable estoppel did not preclude defendant from asserting its statute of limitations defense; whether plaintiff's claim that trial court improperly concluded that nuisance claims were barred by statute of limitations was adequately briefed and properly preserved for appellate review.*

Dion v. Enfield (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 906 . . . . . 144A

Icelo-Hernandez v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 905 . . 143A

In re Emily S. AP210.139, 210 CA 581. . . . . 3A  
*Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court improperly found that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify respondent father with minor child; whether trial court properly found that father was unable or unwilling to benefit from reunification efforts; adoption of trial court's well reasoned decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.*

Karanda v. Bradford, 210 CA 703 . . . . . 125A  
*Negligence; motion to open judgment of nonsuit; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that it lacked statutory (§ 52-212) authority to consider plaintiff's motion to open because plaintiff filed motion without affidavit required by § 52-212 (c); whether affidavit filed more than four months following judgment of nonsuit satisfied substantive requirements of § 52-212; claim that trial court erred in applying standard in § 52-212 for opening judgments upon default or nonsuit, as opposed to statutory (§ 52-212a) standard for opening civil judgments.*

Kolich v. Tudorof (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 905. . . . . 143A

O'Donnell v. AXA Equitable Life Ins. Co., 210 CA 662 . . . . . 84A  
*Breach of contract; whether trial court properly concluded that amended complaint was not materially different from original complaint and, therefore, that plaintiff failed to file new pleading pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 10-44); whether plaintiff waived his right to appeal trial court's ruling striking amended complaint; whether trial court properly granted defendant's motion for entry of judgment or, alternatively, to strike sole count of amended complaint.*

Puteri v. Governor's Ridge Assn., Inc. (See Canner v. Governor's Ridge Assn., Inc.), 210 CA 632 . . . . . 54A

Reyes v. State, 210 CA 714 . . . . . 136A  
*Petition for new trial; arson in second degree; conspiracy to commit criminal mischief in first degree; conspiracy to commit burglary in first degree; claim that trial court improperly denied petition for new trial; whether appeal should have been dismissed due to petitioner's failure to comply with statutory certification requirement (§ 54-95 (a)) prior to commencing appeal.*

Roach v. Transwaste, Inc., 210 CA 686 . . . . . 108A  
*Wrongful termination of employment; motion for attorney's fees; claim that trial court improperly failed to apply lodestar method in calculating amount of attorney's fees; claim that trial court erred in awarding any attorney's fees to plaintiff;*

(continued on next page)

*claim that plaintiff failed to satisfy legal standard for granting attorney's fees; claim that trial court erred by failing to set aside jury's award of damages because it was not supported by sufficient evidence; claim that trial court erred by rendering judgment for plaintiff because there was no evidence to support jury's conclusion that plaintiff's employment had been terminated for filing safety complaints; whether trial court properly instructed jury concerning applicable standard of proof.*

Speer v. SLS Heating, LLC (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 904 . . . . .	142A
Young v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 905. . . . .	143A
Volume 210 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	145A

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Connecticut Bar Examining Committee . . . . .	1B
Notice of Application for Reinstatement to the Bar . . . . .	2B
Appointment of Trustee . . . . .	2B
Notice of Reprimand of Attorney . . . . .	3B