

DOCKET NO: WWMCV156009136S

SUPERIOR COURT

PEREZ, MELANIE

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF WINDHAM
AT PUTNAM

V.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, JUDICIAL
DEPARTMENT

9/4/2015

ORDER

ORDER REGARDING:

04/27/2015 102.00 MOTION TO DISMISS PB 10-30

The foregoing, having been considered by the Court, is hereby:

ORDER:

Plaintiff timely filed a complaint with the CHRO on January 28, 2013 and on January 20, 2015 obtained a release of jurisdiction from the commission in accordance with Conn. Gen. Stat. §46a-100. The discriminatory practice is alleged to have occurred at Plaintiff's work site in Danielson, where Respondent transacts business and which is located in the Judicial District of Windham. Pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46a-100, "[a]ny person who has timely filed a complaint with the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities in accordance with section 46a-82 and who has obtained a release from the commission in accordance with section 46a-83a or 46a-101 may also bring an action in the superior court for the judicial district in which the discriminatory practice is alleged to have occurred or in which the respondent transacts business, except in any action involving a state agency or official may be brought in the superior court for the judicial district of Hartford." While §46a-100 permits an action against the state to be brought in the judicial district of Hartford, it does not require that the action be brought in Hartford. Therefore, venue in this judicial district is proper.

Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is denied on the issue of venue.

The court grants the Motion to Dismiss regarding plaintiff's claims for punitive damages. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is denied as to Plaintiff's claim for interest pursuant to §46a-104 and as to Plaintiff's claims for emotional distress and other compensatory damages.

Judicial Notice (JDNO) was sent regarding this order.

425579

Judge: HARRY E CALMAR

Processed by: Kelly Buerk