

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXIV No. 46

May 23, 2023

235 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Bennett v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 346 C 1019 . . . . .	3
Stanley v. East Hartford (Order), 346 C 1020 . . . . .	4
State v. Armstrong (Order), 346 C 1019 . . . . .	3
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Rothermel (Order), 346 C 1020. . . . .	4
Wihbey v. Zoning Board of Appeals (Order), 346 C 1019 . . . . .	3
Volume 346 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	5

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Ahern v. Board of Education, 219 CA 404 . . . . .	64A
<i>Negligence; summary judgment; final judgments; governmental immunity pursuant to statute (§ 52-557n); indemnification pursuant to statute (§ 10-235); whether plaintiff's claims were barred by § 52-557n; whether summary judgment rendered with respect to some, but not all, counts of complaint brought against defendant board of education was appealable final judgment; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment for certain individual defendants on ground that they were entitled to governmental immunity because there was no genuine issue of material fact that plaintiff was not subject to imminent and apparent harm.</i>	
Carter v. Commissioner of Correction, 219 CA 389 . . . . .	49A
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court incorrectly concluded that trial counsel did not provide ineffective assistance by failing to investigate evidence containing biological material found at crime scene and to submit that evidence for DNA analysis; whether petitioner met his burden under prejudice prong of test set forth in Strickland v. Washington (466 U.S. 668) that, if trial counsel had submitted biological material for DNA analysis, there was reasonable probability that outcome of trial would have been different; whether this court needed to address petitioner's argument as to performance prong of Strickland test.</i>	
K. G. v. T. G. (Memorandum Decision), 219 CA 901 . . . . .	215A
Kohl's Dept. Stores, Inc. v. Rocky Hill, 219 CA 464 . . . . .	124A
<i>Tax appeal; personal property tax assessments; claim that trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence valuations of plaintiff's expert appraiser; whether opinions of plaintiff's expert were speculative and unreliable; claim that trial court's findings that plaintiff was aggrieved and as to true and actual value of plaintiff's personal property were clearly erroneous.</i>	
Lippman v. Dept. of Social Services (Memorandum Decision), 219 CA 901 . . . . .	215A
Padula v. Arborio, 219 CA 432 . . . . .	92A
<i>Adverse possession; claim that trial court erred in concluding that plaintiffs, title holders who never actually possessed property or used disputed area, could establish claim for adverse possession; whether plaintiffs intended users of property to possess property, including disputed area; claim that trial court erred in failing to bar plaintiffs from asserting adverse possession of certain portion of disputed area; whether defendants were sufficiently apprised of precise contours of property that plaintiffs were claiming to have adversely possessed; claim that trial court erred in its determination of area that plaintiffs adversely possessed; claim that trial court erred in concluding that plaintiffs had proven claim of adverse possession for fifteen years by clear and convincing evidence.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Perdikis v. Klarsfeld, 219 CA 343 . . . . . 3A  
*Medical malpractice; general verdict rule; whether trial court erred in instructing jury to consider plaintiff's actions as sole proximate cause of his injuries in absence of any expert medical testimony to support such finding; whether trial court erred in declining to instruct jury in accordance with plaintiff's proposed instructions when defendant placed sole proximate cause of plaintiff's injury at issue without requisite accompanying expert medical testimony; whether trial court's alleged error regarding jury instructions was harmful; claim that general verdict rule applied.*

Reese v. Commissioner of Correction, 219 CA 545 . . . . . 205A  
*Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying petitioner's petition for certification to appeal; claim that habeas court erred in denying petitioner's motion to sequester witness at habeas trial; claim that habeas court erred in dismissing one count of petitioner's amended habeas petition on basis of res judicata; claim that appeal should be dismissed because petitioner, in petition for certification, failed to raise substantive issues he raised on appeal.*

Sease v. Commissioner of Correction, 219 CA 504 . . . . . 164A  
*Habeas corpus; whether habeas court improperly concluded that trial counsel did not render deficient performance in failing to investigate and to focus on petitioner's mental health background at sentencing; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petitioner certification to appeal as to claim that trial counsel rendered deficient performance by failing to challenge admission of certain uncharged misconduct testimony; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petitioner certification to appeal as to claim that state violated his right to due process by knowingly presenting false testimony from coconspirator.*

Volume 219 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . . 217A

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Notice of Disciplinary Order . . . . . 1B  
Bar Examining Committee . . . . . 2B

**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.