

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIII No. 34 February 22, 2022 292 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Daley v. Klein (Order), 341 C 901	43
Day v. Seblatnigg, 341 C 815	3
<i>Conservatorships; declaratory judgment; summary judgment; application for voluntary appointment of conservator pursuant to statute ((Rev. to 2011) § 45a-646); certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's granting of plaintiff's motion for summary judgment; whether irrevocable trust created by voluntarily conserved person was void ab initio and unenforceable because, pursuant to statute ((Rev. to 2011) § 45a-655 (a)), authority to manage conserved person's estate rested exclusively with conservator.</i>	
J. W. v. S. H. (Order), 341 C 902.	44
Nelson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 341 C 902	44
Schoonmaker v. Cribbins (Order), 341 C 901	43
State v. Bouvier (Order), 341 C 903	45
State v. McKinney (Order), 341 C 903	45
State v. Michael F. (Order), 341 C 901	43
U.S. Bank Trust, N.A. v. Healey (Order), 341 C 902.	44
White v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 341 C 903	45
Wright v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 341 C 903.	45
Riccio v. Bristol Hospital, Inc. (replacement pages), 341 C 789-790	v
Volume 341 Cumulative Table of Cases	47
Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities v. Edge Fitness, LLC, 342 C 25	79
<i>Sex discrimination; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff commission's appeal from decision of commission's human rights referee; claim that defendant fitness facilities discriminated against complainants, who identified as males, on basis of sex by providing women's only workout areas in their otherwise public facilities, in violation of Public Accommodation Act (§ 46a-64); whether there was an implied customer gender privacy exception encompassed within § 46a-64 (b) (1), which exempts "separate bathrooms and locker rooms based on sex" from act's general prohibition against sex discrimination in public accommodations.</i>	
Crandle v. Connecticut State Employees Retirement Commission, 342 C 67	121
<i>Administrative appeal; whether trial court properly dismissed appeal from ruling of defendant retirement commission; whether retirement commission incorrectly concluded that, under State Employees Retirement Act (§ 5-152 et seq.), state employee disability retirement benefits become payable on first day of month following receipt of application for such benefits by Retirement Services Division rather than on day following employee's last day of paid state employment; claim that trial court improperly deferred to commission's interpretation of State Employees Retirement Act because that interpretation was neither time-tested, insofar as it was not formally articulated or adopted pursuant to formal rule-making or adjudicatory procedures, nor reasonable; claim that retirement commission, as fiduciary of plaintiffs, former state employees, had burden of proving fair dealing by clear and convincing evidence with respect to commission's use of unwritten practice regarding when disability retirement benefits become payable.</i>	
O. A. v. J. A., 342 C 45	99
<i>Dissolution of marriage; pendente lite orders of alimony, attorney's fees, and expert fees; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that it did not need to consider enforceability of parties' postnuptial agreement prior to awarding plaintiff pen-</i>	

(continued on next page)

dente lite alimony and litigation expenses; whether trial court properly relied on Fitzgerald v. Fitzgerald (169 Conn. 147) and acted within its discretion in deferring its decision on enforceability of parties' postnuptial agreement until end of trial.

Peek v. Manchester Memorial Hospital, 342 C 103 157

Negligence; statute of limitations ((Rev. to 2015) § 52-584); motion for summary judgment; claim that plaintiff's action was barred by two year limitation period set forth in § 52-584; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly construed term "injury" in § 52-584 to mean actionable harm, consistent with this court's decision in Lagassey v. State (268 Conn. 723); whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that, viewing facts in light most favorable to plaintiff, there was genuine issue of material fact regarding whether plaintiff commenced her action within two years from date of her "injury," as that term is understood in context of § 52-584; claim that Appellate Court improperly applied failure to diagnose or latent injury cases to facts of this case; claim that facts of present case were similar to those in Burns v. Hartford Hospital (192 Conn. 451), in which court determined that limitation period set forth in § 52-584 started running when plaintiff sustained injuries; claim that this court in Lagassey improperly neglected to apply statutory (§ 1-2z) plain meaning rule and to interpret term "injury" in § 52-584 to mean hurt, damage, or loss sustained.

State v. Belcher, 342 C 1 55

Motion to correct illegal sentence; kidnapping first degree; sexual assault first degree; robbery first degree; burglary first degree; attempt to commit sexual assault first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that sentencing court substantially relied on materially false information in sentencing defendant, in violation of his right to due process; claim that sentencing court's reliance on superpredator theory, concerning rise of teenage male predatory street criminals who would terrorize society, and sentencing court's characterization of defendant as charter member of that group of superpredators, warranted resentencing.

Volume 342 Cumulative Table of Cases 183

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of America v. Chase Associates, Inc. (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 907 89A

C. L. v. J. E. (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 906 88A

J. E. v. C. L. (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 907 89A

Mercado v. Humberto-Cruz (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 907 89A

National Bank Trust v. Yurov, 210 CA 776 60A

Foreign judgment; claim that trial court erred when it concluded that certified judgment was foreign judgment as defined by statute (§ 50a-31 (2)); claim that trial court erred when it concluded that certification required by statute (§ 52-605 (a)) may be signed by plaintiff's counsel rather than judgment creditor; claim that trial court erred when it refused to open judgment when contract between

(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

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.

<i>plaintiff and defendant required that all disputes be resolved in accordance with Russian law in Russian courts.</i>	
Pickard v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services, 210 CA 788	72A
<i>Wrongful discharge; application to vacate arbitration award; motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly dismissed application to vacate arbitration award for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court lacked jurisdiction to consider petition seeking order pendent lite pursuant to statute (§ 52-422) because no pending arbitration existed at time petition was filed.</i>	
Stratford v. 500 North Avenue, LLC, 210 CA 718	2A
<i>Foreclosure; standing; subject matter jurisdiction; motion to dismiss appeal; whether defendant lacked standing to bring appeal challenging foreclosure judgment.</i>	
Washburn v. Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co. (Memorandum Decision), 210 CA 906	88A
Wheeler v. Beachcroft, LLC, 210 CA 725	9A
<i>Quiet title; whether trial court properly determined that certain owners of waterfront lot in housing development were not parties to settlement agreement in dispute over access to Long Island Sound; claim that status of owners of waterfront lot as parties to settlement agreement was not before trial court; claim that trial court abused its discretion by not conducting evidentiary hearing as to whether owners of waterfront lot were parties to settlement agreement; standard of review, determined; whether trial court altered or omitted material terms contained in settlement agreement when it entered orders to implement agreement.</i>	
Volume 210 Cumulative Table of Cases	91A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

DOH—Notice of Availability of List of Municipalities Exempt from the Affordable Housing Appeals Procedure	1B
Dept. of Public Health—Notice of Hearing.	1B
CT Paid Family & Medical Leave Insurance Authority	2B

MISCELLANEOUS

Bar Examining Committee	1C
-----------------------------------	----