

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXV No. 50

June 11, 2024

282 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Dept. of Public Health <i>v.</i> Estrada, 349 C 223	3
<i>Administrative appeal; alleged retaliation by plaintiff employer against defendant employee for employee's purported whistleblower disclosure; certification from Appellate Court; whether defendant Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities had subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate employee's whistleblower retaliation claim brought pursuant to statute (§ 4-61dd); whether commission waived and abandoned several merits arguments by failing to raise or brief them before this court or Appellate Court; claim that employee's disclosure concerned misconduct in municipal government to which § 4-61dd does not apply; whether employee was entitled to whistleblower protection under § 4-61dd for reporting her own error; whether employee failed to prove that employer's adverse personnel actions were result of employee's reporting of her errors rather than fact that employee had made such errors.</i>	
Grant <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Order), 349 C 912	50
Volume 349 Cumulative Table of Cases	81

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Altavista Investments, LLC <i>v.</i> Makeeva, 226 CA 175.	177A
<i>Summary process; motion to intervene; claim that trial court improperly determined that prospective intervenor, which held note that was secured by mortgage on plaintiff's real property, was not proper party to eviction action related to that property and was not entitled to intervene in postjudgment proceedings pursuant to statute (§ 47a-35b) regarding final distribution of use and occupancy payments made by defendants during pendency of their appeal of trial court's judgment in eviction action.</i>	
Brennan <i>v.</i> Board of Assessment Appeals, 226 CA 191.	193A
<i>Real estate tax appeal; claim that trial court erroneously determined that plaintiff had abandoned his claim regarding proper valuation of his residential dwelling during trial; claim that trial court improperly considered factors in statute governing classification of land as farmland (§ 12-107c) in its determination that plaintiff's property was no longer being used as farm pursuant to statute (§ 12-504h); claim that trial court erroneously determined that plaintiff had changed use of nonresidential property so as to have lost entitlement to farmland designation previously granted to him by town tax assessor.</i>	
C. W. <i>v.</i> E. W., 226 CA 144	146A
<i>Breach of contract; unjust enrichment; quantum meruit; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment for defendants on plaintiff's breach of contract claim; claim that trial court failed to consider judicial admissions allegedly made by defendants in original answers as to existence of alleged oral contract to sell property to plaintiff; whether trial court, in ruling on plaintiff's unjust enrichment claim, erred in finding that plaintiff's evidence of his labor at property was unreliable.</i>	
GHP Media, Inc. <i>v.</i> Hughes, 226 CA 162	164A
<i>Indemnification; motion to strike third-party complaint; claim that trial court improperly granted third-party defendants' motion to strike third-party complaint seeking indemnification; whether third-party plaintiff, rival printing company,</i>	

(continued on next page)

and third-party defendants, who were officers of plaintiff printing company, owed identical duties to plaintiff printing company to protect trade secrets and other proprietary information from being used by third-party plaintiff.

Greenwich v. Freedom of Information Commission, 226 CA 40. 42A
Administrative appeal; claim that trial court improperly substituted its judgment for that of defendant Freedom of Information Commission by concluding that requested records were preliminary drafts exempt from disclosure under statute (§ 1-210 (b) (1)); whether trial court improperly concluded that it was not necessary for town plaintiffs to review requested records to determine that those records were preliminary drafts and that public interest in withholding records outweighed public interest in disclosure pursuant to § 1-210 (b) (1); whether commission’s order directing plaintiffs to retrieve requested records and to disclose them to defendant requestor “free of charge” constituted abuse of its discretion; whether plaintiffs’ proffered alternative ground for affirmance, that requested records were exempt from disclosure as records of standards, procedures, processes, software and codes under § 1-210 (b) (20), was persuasive.

In re A. H., 226 CA 1 3A
Termination of parental rights; whether trial court’s reliance in adjudicatory phase of termination trial on social studies prepared by Department of Children and Families violated statute (§ 45a-717) and rule of practice (§ 35a-9); reviewability of respondent’s unreserved claim that trial court’s use of social studies in adjudicatory phase of termination trial violated his due process rights; whether trial court improperly admitted hearsay evidence; whether respondent demonstrated that he was harmed by admission of alleged hearsay evidence.

Michel v. Hartford, 226 CA 98 100A
Employment discrimination; claim of retaliation in violation of federal statute (42 U.S.C. § 1983) for exercise of rights guaranteed by first amendment to United States constitution; claim of retaliation in violation of state statute (§ 31-51q) for exercise of rights guaranteed by article first of Connecticut constitution; motion to strike; claim that trial court improperly granted defendant city’s motion to strike claim alleging retaliation in violation of § 1983 for failure to adequately plead facts to establish that defendant’s policies, practices, or customs led to violation of plaintiff’s constitutional rights, as required for municipal liability; claim that trial court improperly concluded that plaintiff failed to plead facts that, if proven, would establish that his deposition testimony related to fellow employee’s race discrimination claim was speech on matter of public concern pursuant to § 31-51q; claim that trial court erroneously determined that it was plaintiff’s burden to allege facts to establish that his speech did not substantially or materially interfere with his job performance or working relationship between him and his employer pursuant to § 31-51q.

Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel v. Vaccaro, 226 CA 75 77A
Attorney presentment; whether trial court improperly suspended respondent attorney from practice of law for ninety days after attorney’s inaction during representation of client led to dismissal, with prejudice, of client’s personal injury lawsuit; claim

(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.

that trial court erred when it failed to consider respondent's assertion that his due process rights were violated and that he was prejudiced as result of delay in underlying disciplinary proceedings; claim that trial court mistakenly believed it was precluded from considering respondent's due process rights and delay in underlying disciplinary proceedings as mitigating factor in determining punishment for respondent's misconduct; claim that respondent could not have appealed from ruling by reviewing committee of Statewide Grievance Committee denying his motion to dismiss grievance complaint against him; claim that trial court abused its discretion because ninety day suspension was excessive and out of proportion to offense committed.

Romanelli v. Dept. of Social Services, 226 CA 131	133A
<i>Administrative appeal; claim that trial court erred in determining that defendant Department of Social Services did not abuse its discretion when it included value of property contained in trust in its calculations to determine whether applicant exceeded asset limit for Medicaid eligibility; claim that defendant violated due process by failing to provide notice to applicant that revocability of trust was at issue in calculating his Medicaid eligibility.</i>	
United Cleaning & Restoration, LLC v. Bank of America, N.A. (replacement pages), 225 Conn. App.	v
Volume 226 Cumulative Table of Cases	213A

NOTICE OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

DSS—SPA 24-0013: Notice of Proposed Medicaid State Plan Amendment (SPA) Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHC) Stabilization Payment	1B
---	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Docket & Case Assignments for Supreme & Appellate Courts for the 2024-2025 Court Year	1C
Notice of Suspension of Attorney	2C
Notice of Reprimand of Attorney	2C