

DOCKET NO: AANCV186026817S

SUPERIOR COURT

CINOTTI, LUCIA
V.
SOVRAN ACQUISITION LIMITED
PARTNERSHIP DBA UNCLE B Et Al

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF ANSONIA/
MILFORD
AT MILFORD

6/1/2018

ORDER

ORDER REGARDING:
05/18/2018 103.00 OBJECTION TO REQUEST TO REVISE

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

ORDER:

RULING ON THE PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO THE DEFENDANT'S REQUESTS TO REVISE
THE COMPLAINT

The plaintiff's objections to the defendant's first and second requests to revise are SUSTAINED.

The plaintiff's objection to the defendant's third request to revise is:

OVERRULED to the following extent. The plaintiff is required to present, and is ordered to present, its factual allegations that rely on a statute by pleading and identifying the statute at issue. P.B. § 10-3.

SUSTAINED to the extent that defendant's request is based on the claim that more facts should be pleaded in order to assert a sufficient claim. Whether sufficient facts have been pleaded to state a legally sufficient claim raises an issue better addressed through a motion to strike rather than a request to revise. See generally, *Melfi v. Danbury*, 70 Conn. App. 679, 684, cert. denied, 261 Conn. 922 (2002) ("request to revise may not ordinarily be used to substantively challenge a pleading.")

410631

Judge: BARRY STEVENS