

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXVI No. 12

September 17, 2024

422 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Dur-A-Flex, Inc. v. Dy, 349 C 513	3
<i>Breach of noncompete agreement; breach of common-law duty of confidentiality; misappropriation of trade secrets in violation of Connecticut Uniform Trade Secrets Act (CUTSA) (§ 35-50 et seq.); malicious misappropriation; civil conspiracy; injunctive relief; sanctions; attorney's fees; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that certain defendants did not misappropriate plaintiff's trade secrets in violation of CUTSA; whether certain defendants "used" plaintiff's trade secrets within meaning of statute (§ 35-51 (b) (2) (B) (iii)) defining "misappropriation"; whether trial court's finding that certain defendants did not know or have reason to know that named defendant had misappropriated plaintiff's trade secrets was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment on plaintiff's civil conspiracy claims as to certain defendants on ground that it was procedurally improper for trial court to grant motion for summary judgment during trial and on ground that those civil conspiracy claims were preempted by CUTSA; claim that trial court improperly denied plaintiff's request to enjoin certain defendants from using plaintiff's trade secrets in future; whether trial court abused its discretion in imposing monetary penalty on plaintiff and awarding attorney's fees to defendants as sanctions for attempted spoliation of evidence; whether amount of sanctions and attorney's fees was grossly disproportionate to harm suffered by defendants and trial court; whether trial court abused its discretion in awarding attorney's fees to certain defendants pursuant to statute (§ 35-54) on ground that plaintiff's claims of misappropriation against them were made in bad faith; claim that trial court misconstrued knowledge requirement in § 35-51 (b) (2) (B) (iii) as requiring proof only that defendants knew or should have known that trade secret had been misappropriated rather than knowledge of trade secret itself; claim that trial court failed to properly balance defendants' interest in pursuing their livelihoods in area of their greatest expertise with plaintiff's interest in protecting itself from unfair competition when it determined that they had misappropriated plaintiff's trade secrets; claim that plaintiff failed to identify its trade secrets with sufficient particularity in its complaint and its responses to certain interrogatories; whether trial court applied incorrect standard in crafting its orders of monetary and injunctive relief as to certain defendants; claim that trial court's injunctive relief was impermissibly vague and restrictive; claim that trial court improperly limited testimony of plaintiff's damages expert; whether trial court correctly determined that noncompete agreement between plaintiff and at-will employee was unenforceable for lack of consideration; whether trial court correctly determined that CUTSA preempted plaintiff's claim that named defendant violated common-law duty of confidentiality; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment for certain defendants on civil conspiracy claims on ground that those claims were preempted by CUTSA; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that certain defendants did not act maliciously in misappropriating plaintiff's trade secrets; whether plaintiff was entitled to punitive damages and attorney's fees pursuant to statute (§ 35-53 (b)) governing damages for malicious misappropriation.</i>	
Dur-A-Flex, Inc. v. Dy, 349 C 612	102
<i>Breach of noncompete agreement; breach of common-law duty of confidentiality; violation of Connecticut Uniform Trade Secrets Act (CUTSA) (§ 35-50 et seq.); summary judgment; whether trial court incorrectly determined that noncompete</i>	

(continued on next page)

agreement was unenforceable as matter of law; claim that noncompete agreement was enforceable because defendant had reaffirmed his promise not to compete; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment for defendant on claim of breach of duty of confidentiality on ground that it was preempted by CUTSA; decision in companion case, *Dur-A-Flex, Inc. v. Dy* (349 Conn. 513), dispositive of issues on appeal.

Epright v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co., 349 C 679 169

Writ of error; certification from Appellate Court; whether trial court improperly sanctioned plaintiff in error law firm for conducting ex parte communications with expert witness previously disclosed by opposing party; whether, under rule of practice (§ 13-4) governing expert discovery, attorney may be sanctioned for ex parte communications with opposing party's disclosed expert witness; whether § 13-4 was reasonably clear in prohibiting ex parte communications with another party's disclosed expert witness; request that this court exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to prohibit such ex parte communications.

In re M. S. (Order), 349 C 920 190

In re P. M. (Order), 349 C 919 189

131 Beach Road, LLC v. Town Plan & Zoning Commission, 349 C 647 137

Zoning; appeal from decision of defendant plan and zoning commission denying plaintiff's request for text amendment to town's zoning regulations and conditionally approving plaintiff's request for approval of site plan and issuance of certificate of zoning compliance for proposed affordable housing development; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that zoning commission had failed to meet its burden under affordable housing statute (§ 8-30g (g)) of demonstrating that condition placed on approval of plaintiff's affordable housing application was necessary to protect a substantial public interest that outweighed need for affordable housing; whether visual impact of proposed affordable housing development on neighboring historic district was significant so as to override need for public housing in town; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that zoning commission was required to apply § 8-30g to plaintiff's request for text amendment to zoning regulations that would create new permissible use for affordable housing in district zoned exclusively for single family dwellings.

Woodbridge Newton Neighborhood Environmental Trust v. Connecticut Siting Council, 349 C 619. 109

Application for certificate of environmental compatibility and public need pursuant to Public Utility Environmental Standards Act (§ 16-50g et seq.); whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's appeal from decision of defendant siting council approving application of defendant telecommunications company to construct cell phone tower in certain location; claim that plaintiff nonprofit association of real property owners lacked standing, as intervenor pursuant to statute (§ 22a-19), to raise issue of property values; claim that council had improperly declined to consider impact of proposed tower on private property values; whether private property values are among enumerated or unenumerated statutory (§ 16-50p (a))

(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.

(3) (B) criteria that siting council is required to consider in acting on application; claim that council's decision was unsupported by substantial evidence. 191

Volume 349 Cumulative Table of Cases 191

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Hallock v. Hallock, 228 CA 81 83A
Dissolution of marriage; pendente lite motions for alimony and counsel fees; legal standard for determination of alimony and distribution of marital property; statutes (§§ 46b-81 and 46b-82) governing alimony and marital property distribution, discussed; judicial notice.

Karen v. Loftus, 228 CA 163 165A
Dissolution of marriage; motion to open; subject matter jurisdiction; statutory (§ 52-420 (b)) time limit to challenge arbitration award allegedly obtained by fraud, discussed; probable cause standard, discussed.

Labieniec v. Megna, 228 CA 127 129A
Postjudgment motion for modification of child custody; postjudgment motion for order seeking passport for child.

Mystic Oil Co. v. Shaukat, LLC, 228 CA 147 149A
Breach of contract; breach of guarantee; damages award; motion for attorney's fees; evidentiary hearing.

State v. Giannone, 228 CA 11 13A
Sale of assault weapon; possession of silencer; possession of large capacity magazine; motion to dismiss; motion to suppress; constitutionality of weapons statutes (§§ 53-202b, 53-202w and 53a-211); defendant's right to bear arms under second amendment to United States constitution; adjudication of defendant's as applied constitutional challenge under New York State Rifle & Pistol Assn., Inc. v. Bruen (597 U.S. 1), discussed.

State v. Shane K., 228 CA 105 107A
Assault third degree; criminal violation of protective order; motion to dismiss or transfer for improper venue; due process; statute (§ 51-352c (a) and (b)) governing jurisdiction of criminal charges; instructional error; waiver.

White v. FCW Law Offices, 228 CA 1 3A
Identity theft; Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); damages.

Volume 227 Cumulative Table of Cases 209A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Hearing 1C

Notice of Reprimand of Attorney 2C
