

**Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 328**

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Bozelko v. Statewide Construction, Inc. (Order)	907
Burke v. Mesniaeff (Order)	901
Colon v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	907
Cuozzo v. Orange (Order)	906
Griswold v. Camputaro (Order)	904
In re Damian G. (Order)	902
In re Jacob W. (Order)	902
Kirby of Norwich v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act	38
<i>Unemployment compensation; whether members of plaintiff's sales force who engaged in door-to-door sales of plaintiff's products were employees of plaintiff or independent contractors under Unemployment Compensation Act (§ 31-222 et seq.); whether trial court correctly determined that plaintiff failed to establish that sales representatives were customarily engaged in independently established trade, occupation, profession or business of same nature as that involved in service performed for plaintiff, as required by part C of ABC test, as set forth in § 31-222 (a) (1) (B) (ii) (I), (II) and (III), which governs determination of whether services performed by individual constitute employment; claim that trial court interpreted § 31-222 (a) (1) (B) (ii) (III) too narrowly and incorrectly concluded that sales representatives were plaintiff's employees; whether trial court properly dismissed appeals from decisions of defendant Employment Security Board of Review; failure of plaintiff to present evidence of factors that court may consider under totality of circumstances test for evaluating dynamics of relationship between putative employee and employer; claim that this court should reconsider and overrule prior case law holding that part C of ABC test is satisfied only if putative employee is actually engaged in independently established trade, occupation, profession or business of same nature as that involved in service performed for putative employer.</i>	
Martinez v. New Haven	1
<i>Negligent supervision; claim, pursuant to statute (§ 52-557n), that defendant city and defendant board of education were negligent in failing to properly supervise students in auditorium; whether trial court improperly determined that plaintiff schoolchild, who at school during school hours, satisfied imminent harm to identifiable persons exception to governmental immunity; whether plaintiff failed to satisfy imminent harm prong of that exception because he failed to prove that it was apparent to defendants that claimed dangerous condition, namely, students running with safety scissors, was so likely to cause harm that clear and unequivocal duty to act immediately was created; claim that defendants failed to plead governmental immunity as special defense in operative answer; whether trial court, which never expressly ruled on defendants' request to amend their answer to include governmental immunity as special defense, implicitly granted request to amend answer and overruled objection thereto.</i>	
Rockwell v. Rockwell (Order)	902
Spencer v. Spencer (Order)	903
State v. Johnson (Order)	905
State v. Josephs	21
<i>Cruelty to animals; claim that statute (§ 53-247 [a]) prohibiting person from unjustifiably injuring animal requires proof that defendant had specific intent to injure animal; whether trial court properly concluded that § 53-247 (a) required only general intent to engage in conduct in question; claim that § 53-247 (a) was unconstitutionally vague as applied to defendant's conduct; whether defendant's conduct clearly came within unmistakable core of conduct prohibited under § 53-247 (a); whether evidence was sufficient to convict defendant pursuant to § 53-247 (a).</i>	
State v. Neary (Order)	901
State v. Smith (Order)	906

State <i>v.</i> Stanley (Order)	907
U.S. Bank National Assn., Trustee <i>v.</i> Blowers (Order)	904
Wiederman <i>v.</i> Halpert (Order)	906