

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXV No. 42 April 16, 2024 273 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Buie v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 348 C 962	66
Callahan v. Healthcare Services Group-Meriden Care Center (Order), 348 C 962.	66
Clue v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 348 C 961	65
Hepburn v. Brill, 348 C 827	33
<i>Third-party petition for visitation; motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly dismissed plaintiff's initial petition for visitation and amended petition for visitation with plaintiff's minor niece; whether trial court improperly treated defendant's motion to dismiss as implicating trial court's subject matter jurisdiction rather than its authority to act pursuant to third-party visitation statute (§ 46b-59); whether judicial gloss applied to § 46b-59 in Roth v. Weston (259 Conn. 202), to render statute constitutional was still required in view of legislature's subsequent amendment (P.A. 12-137, § 1) to that statute; whether this court could consider allegations in plaintiff's amended petition or must consider only allegations in initial petition, in view of defendant's pending motion to dismiss initial petition; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that amended petition did not include specific and good faith allegations necessary to demonstrate existence of plaintiff's parent-like relationship with niece and that niece would suffer real and significant harm if visitation were to be denied; Igersheim v. Bezruczyk (197 Conn. App. 412), to extent that it held that it was improper for trial court to consider amended petition filed during pendency of motion to dismiss initial petition for third-party visitation, overruled.</i>	
In re Ava M. (Order), 348 C 962	66
Is Ra El Bey v. U.S. Bank, National Assn. (Order), 348 C 959.	63
Mercedes-Benz Financial v. 1188 Stratford Avenue, LLC, 348 C 796	2
<i>Breach of contract; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court improperly upheld trial court's denial of defendants' motion to open and to set aside default judgment pursuant to statute ((Rev. to 2019) § 52-212); claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to open on grounds that it was untimely and had no basis.</i>	
Metropolitan District Commission v. Marriott International, Inc. (Order), 348 C 963	67
National Bank Trust v. Yurov (Order), 348 C 961	65
Rader v. Valeri (Order), 348 C 959	63
Silano v. Cooney (Order), 348 C 960	64
State v. Dyous (Order), 348 C 960.	64
State v. Torell (Order), 348 C 960	64
U.S. Bank Trust, N.A. v. Clarke (Order), 348 C 963.	67
Volume 348 Cumulative Table of Cases	69

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Burr v. Grossman Chevrolet-Nissan, Inc., 224 CA 688	2A
<i>Breach of contract; fraud; theft; violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); claim that trial court misinterpreted plaintiffs' legal claims; claim that trial court erred in relying on testimony of defendant's representative in rendering judgment for defendant; claim that trial court erred in finding certain facts in support of its judgment for defendant.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Cardoza v. Waterbury, 224 CA 813. 147A
Negligence; municipal defective highway statute (§ 13a-149); motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court erred in granting defendant city's pretrial motion to dismiss, which was predicated on plaintiff's alleged failure to comply with notice requirements of § 13a-149; whether trial court had subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's complaint; whether savings clause of § 13a-149 cured any deficiencies in plaintiff's notice.

Flynn v. Kohler (Memorandum Decision), 224 CA 904 184A
Green Tree Servicing, LLC v. Clark, 224 CA 740 74A
Foreclosure; Emergency Mortgage Assistance Program (EMAP) (§ 8-265ee); post-judgment motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that plaintiff mortgagee failed to comply with notice provision of EMAP, as required by § 8-265ee (a); whether trial court properly denied defendant's postjudgment motion to dismiss on ground that it constituted impermissible collateral attack on foreclosure judgment; whether defendant waived right to raise claim concerning EMAP compliance.

Hartford v. Johnson (Memorandum Decision), 224 CA 904 184A
Jefferson Solar, LLC v. Dept. of Energy & Environmental Protection, 224 CA 688 22A
Declaratory judgment; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court improperly dismissed plaintiff's action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that program requirements for shared clean energy facilities issued pursuant to statute (§ 16-244z) were regulations under Uniform Administrative Procedure Act (§ 4-166 et seq.).

Jefferson Solar, LLC v. FuelCell Energy, Inc., 224 CA 710 44A
Competitive bidding for award of contract to construct shared clean energy facility; declaratory judgment; injunctive relief; standing; motion to dismiss; challenge to award of contract for shared clean energy facility by unsuccessful bidder; whether trial court improperly dismissed plaintiff's action for lack of standing; whether trial court improperly determined that plaintiff's claims for damages were too indirect and remote from alleged wrongdoing by successful bidder; claim that trial court improperly concluded that shared clean energy facility contract was public contract; whether trial court improperly determined that plaintiff, as disappointed bidder for public contract, lacked standing to challenge award of contract for shared clean energy facility because it failed to demonstrate fraud, corruption or favoritism that undermined integrity of bidding process; disappointed bidder doctrine, discussed.

Lyons v. Birmingham Law Office, LLC, 224 CA 758 92A
Personal jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly concluded that requirements of statute (§ 52-59b (a)) governing long arm jurisdiction had not been satisfied as to Vermont resident defendants involved in sale of Vermont real property by Connecticut resident; claim that trial court improperly concluded that exercising jurisdiction over defendants would violate their constitutional due process rights.

(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

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.

State v. Berrios, 224 CA 827 161A
Burglary first degree; persistent felony offender; postsentencing motions to vacate guilty plea; claim that defendant's conviction in prior trial of assault in third degree and acquittal of criminal mischief in third degree precluded state from retrying him on charge of burglary in first degree because jury in prior trial had been unable to reach unanimous verdict on burglary charge; whether trial court lacked jurisdiction to rule on defendant's motions.

Travinski v. General Ins. Co. of America, 224 CA 838 127A
Breach of contract; Connecticut Unauthorized Insurers Act (CUIA) (§ 38a-271 et seq.); summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motion for summary judgment with respect to plaintiffs' claims of breach of contract and violation of CUIA; claim that trial court improperly permitted certain of defendants to file motion for summary judgment without posting bond pursuant to applicable statute (§ 38a-27).

Y. H. v. J. B., 224 CA 793 127A
Dissolution of marriage; motion for contempt; whether trial court abused its discretion in declining to award child support to defendant on ground that it was not requested by either party; whether trial court improperly declined to award child support without considering applicable statutes and child support guidelines; claim that trial court's award of attorney's fees, to extent it was imposed as sanction for defendant's contempt, constituted abuse of its discretion; whether trial court reasonably could have concluded that defendant had not complied with trial court's orders and that noncompliance was wilful; whether award of attorney's fees to plaintiff, to extent it was made pursuant to statute (§ 46b-62) providing for award of attorney's fees in marital dissolution action, must be reconsidered in light of remand for new trial on all financial issues.

Metroplolotan District Commission v. Marriott International, Inc. 216 CA (replacement pages), 153, 154 v
Volume 224 Cumulative Table of Cases 185A

NOTICE OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Notice of Pendency of Reinstatement Application 1B