
Week of October 6

Welcome to our Supreme and Appellate Court summaries webpage. On this page, I provide abbreviated summaries of decisions from the Connecticut appellate courts which highlight important issues and developments in Connecticut law, and provide practical practice pointers to litigants. I have been summarizing these court decisions internally for our firm for more than 10 years, and providing relevant highlights to my municipal and insurance practice clients for almost as long. It was suggested that a wider audience might appreciate brief summaries of recent rulings that condense often long and confusing decisions down to their basic elements. These summaries are limited to the civil litigation decisions based on my own particular field of practice, so you will not find distillations of the many criminal and matrimonial law decisions on this page. I may from time to time add commentary, and may even criticize a decision's reasoning. Such commentary is solely my opinion . . . and when mistakes of trial counsel are highlighted because they triggered a particular outcome, I will try to be mindful of the adage . . . "There but for the grace of God . . ." I hope the reader finds these summaries helpful. – Edward P. McCreery

Posted October 6, 2014

- AC35463 - Bethlehem v. Acker

Trial court properly concluded that the smaller breeds of a large group of approximately 80 dogs “rescued” by a self-styled dog rescuer, and kept in frigid temperatures in a an unheated barn were properly deemed *neglected* and subject to Town seizure and that the larger breed dogs with thick coats were not, as they were more tolerant of the cold. The standard to apply is found in the statutes and so the trial court also properly excluded the defendant's offer of testimony from Bridgeport's dog warden on an alleged “standard of care” for rescued dogs. The order that the parties should agree on which category the dogs fell into was vague, however, and the matter was remanded for the court to make specific findings in that regard. [The author discloses that he has been involved in a matter adverse to the defendant on behalf of another town which also involved the warehousing of an excessive number of dogs.]

- AC35741 - Martocchio v. Savoir

[Grandparent visitation rights.]

- AC35508 - State v. Brown

Week of October 6

- AC35508 Dissent - State v. Brown

The facts and holdings of any case may be redacted, paraphrased or condensed for ease of reading. No summary can be an exact rendering of any decision, however, so interested readers are referred to the full decisions. The docket number of each case is a hyperlink to the Connecticut Judicial Department online slip opinion. ©2014 Pullman & Comley, LLC. All Rights Reserved.

The factual summary, or even the legal conclusions, of any case may be summarized, redacted, paraphrased or altered at the author's discretion for ease of reading. Accuracy of the summary cannot be guaranteed and the viewer is referred to the actual case for an exact reading. The Docket number should be a link to the full decision.