

**Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 177**

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

<p>Bank of New York Mellon, Trustee v. Mauro</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Foreclosure; whether trial court improperly granted motion for judgment of strict foreclosure on basis of ruling granting motion for summary judgment as to liability for foreclosure; claim that genuine issues of material fact existed as to whether counterclaims had reasonable nexus to making, validity, or enforcement of mortgage and note that precluded granting of motion for summary judgment; whether trial court properly concluded that counterclaims based on alleged misdealings with defendants by original lender failed as matter of law because there was no evidence of record that plaintiff expressly assumed liabilities of original lender when it took mortgage from original lender by assignment; whether trial court properly rendered judgment in favor of plaintiff on all five counts of counterclaim; whether trial court properly rendered judgment dismissing counterclaims that pertained to plaintiff's conduct during mediation that occurred years after execution of mortgage and defendants' default; whether counterclaims were improperly joined in action pursuant to transaction test of applicable rule of practice (§ 10-10); motion for summary judgment seeking dismissal of counterclaims for improper joinder treated as motion to strike; whether party may properly use motion for summary judgment as means of testing whether counterclaims satisfied transaction test of § 10-10.</i></p>	<p>295</p>
<p>Bruno v. Bruno</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court, in vacating prior awards of postjudgment interest, exceeded specific direction of remand order from Appellate Court; whether trial court properly vacated awards of postjudgment interest that previously had been awarded in connection with alimony arrearage and bank account in dispute between parties; whether prior awards of postjudgment interest were inextricably intertwined with court's earlier erroneous decision to grant motion for modification of alimony and valuing bank account; whether trial court abused its discretion in awarding defendant interest with regard to alimony arrearage and bank account in dispute between parties; claim that trial court erred in employing incorrect time frame and improper rate in calculating subsequent awards of postjudgment interest; whether trial court abused its discretion in awarding interest at rate of 4 percent; whether trial court properly held defendant in contempt for violating court order; whether underlying order was sufficiently clear and unambiguous as to support judgment of contempt.</i></p>	<p>599</p>
<p>Byrd v. Commissioner of Correction</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Habeas corpus; claim that ex post facto law passed after petitioner was sentenced improperly invalidated application of risk reduction credits toward petitioner's parole eligibility date; motion for summary judgment; whether habeas court properly determined that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over habeas petition; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether ex post facto prohibition was implicated where changes to law had no bearing on punishment to which petitioner's criminal conduct exposed him when he committed crime; whether parole eligibility under statute (§ 54-125a) constitutes cognizable liberty interest sufficient to invoke habeas jurisdiction.</i></p>	<p>71</p>
<p>Darryl W. v. Commissioner of Correction</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to file request to charge jury or to object to trial court's jury instruction on operability of firearm; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to direct trial court in response to jury's inquiry on operability; whether petitioner demonstrated that he was prejudiced by trial counsel's performance.</i></p>	<p>454</p>
<p>Diehl v. Powell (Memorandum Decision)</p>	<p>902</p>
<p>Eder's Appeal from Probate</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Probate appeal; remainder beneficiaries of irrevocable trust; claim that trial court improperly concluded that settlor's intent in adopting two adult children was</i></p>	<p>163</p>

- not relevant to determination of whether adoptions were sham; claim that trial court erred in holding purpose of trust was not contravened by settlor's adoption of two adult children; whether adults adopted by settlor could be considered natural objects of settlor's bounty; whether adopted children were allowed to take under trust; whether intent of trust is determined from language of trust.*
- Emerick v. Glastonbury*. 701
Private nuisance; whether trial court abused its discretion in dismissing action as sanction for plaintiff's actions during trial; whether plaintiff's continuing and deliberate misconduct during trial demonstrated such disregard for trial court's orders as to warrant dismissal; claim that trial court did not adhere to standards of stare decisis; claim that dismissal followed from finding of contempt or because of judicial bias; claim that trial court failed to consider motions for mistrial or requests for recusal; claim that dismissal violated plaintiff's constitutional right to procedural process; failure to brief claim adequately.
- Faille v. Stratford*. 183
*Tax appeals; whether trial court abused its discretion in rendering judgments of nonsuit; whether more deferential general abuse of discretion standard of review applied to trial court's judgments of nonsuit, or more nuanced abuse of discretion standard as set forth in *Millbrook Owners Assn., Inc. v. Hamilton Standard* (257 Conn. 1); whether trial court's findings that plaintiff violated court's pretrial settlement conference order by not having someone with ultimate authority to settle matters present at pretrial settlement conference, and by failing to bring to conference every physical piece of paper that would be offered into evidence at trial were clearly erroneous; whether plaintiff established clear error in trial court's finding that attorney did not have ultimate authority to settle tax appeals related to plaintiff limited liability company; whether dismissal or nonsuit as sanction for failure of party to attend pretrial settlement conference when party was ill and in hospital served justice or vindicated legitimate interests of other party and court.*
- Fernschild v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles* 472
Suspension of motor vehicle operator's license; whether record contained substantial evidence to support hearing officer's determination that plaintiff refused to submit to breath test to determine his blood alcohol content in violation of statute (§ 14-227b).
- Garvey v. Valencis*. 578
Child custody and visitation; claim that trial court improperly entered emergency ex parte custody order in violation of statute (§ 46b-56f [c]) because plaintiff was available, desired to participate, and was present in courthouse when court entered ex parte order; claim that § 46b-56f (c) mandates that hearing be completed within fourteen days after emergency ex parte order is issued; whether trial court's ex parte order expired automatically after thirty days, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 4-5); whether trial court violated plaintiff's constitutional right to procedural due process by entering ex parte custody order, and then extending order for unreasonably lengthy period of time; whether plaintiff waived her right to object to length of hearing; whether trial court's finding that immediate and present risk of psychological harm to child existed was clearly erroneous.
- In re Ceana R.* 758
Child neglect; whether trial court abused its discretion in permitting respondent father's fourth appointed counsel to withdraw as counsel; whether trial court properly determined that de facto termination of attorney-client relationship occurred based on father's filing of grievance against his fourth appointed counsel in juvenile proceeding; whether trial court abused its discretion in finding that father waived his statutory right to appointed counsel by his conduct.
- JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Essaghof*. 144
Foreclosure; whether trial court's finding that defendants were not fraudulently induced into executing agreement to modify original loan was clearly erroneous; whether trial court abused discretion in rejecting special defense of unclean hands; whether trial court properly found that representations were not false; claim that originator of loan had concealed motivation for modification agreement and that defendants were pressured into signing modification agreement; claim that trial court abused discretion by granting motion for equitable relief; whether trial court improperly ordered defendants to reimburse plaintiff for property taxes paid during pending appeal.

Lange v. Stratford (See Faile v. Stratford) 183

Little v. Commissioner of Correction 337

Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal as to claim that State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509) applied retroactively to collateral attack on kidnapping conviction when, pursuant to plea agreement, petitioner pleaded guilty to only that charge; adoption of general presumption that Salamon applies retroactively in habeas corpus proceedings; whether traditional rationales underlying writ of habeas corpus favored applying Salamon retroactively; whether there was risk that petitioner stood convicted of act that law did not make criminal; reviewability of claim of actual innocence raised for first time on appeal.

McFarline v. Mickens 83

Negligence; summary judgment; claim that issues of material fact existed as to whether plaintiff's injury from trip and fall on public sidewalk was caused by negligence of abutting property owner due to defective sidewalk with grass growing wildly through crack; whether abutting landowner owed duty to maintain public sidewalk in reasonably safe condition; whether positive act exception to general rule absolving landowners of liability for defective sidewalks applied; claim that trial court erroneously considered facts outside of record and thereby violated plaintiff's right to due process of law; claim that trial court abused discretion by denying motions to reargue and to amend complaint.

McLeod v. A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. 423

Fraud; breach of implied warranty of merchantability in connection with sale of automobile; whether trial court improperly rendered judgment for plaintiff on count of complaint alleging breach of implied warranty of merchantability when court previously dismissed that count; whether, once count was dismissed by trial court, it was effectively removed from case and court had no authority to address merits of dismissed count in its final decision; whether, in light of trial court's dismissal of count alleging breach of implied warranty of merchantability, court improperly determined that defendant violated Magnuson-Moss Act (15 U.S.C. § 2310 [d]), which was based on defendant's alleged breach of implied warranty of merchantability; whether trial court improperly awarded attorney's fees as component of damages under count alleging violation of Magnuson-Moss Act; whether trial court's finding of fraud was legally and logically correct and supported by evidence; whether trial court's finding that defendant made false statement by failing to disclose accurate odometer reading was clearly erroneous; whether trial court improperly awarded punitive damages under fraud count.

N759ZD, LLC v. Stratford (See Faile v. Stratford). 183

Pellet v. Keller Williams Realty Corp. 42

Contracts; whether trial court improperly directed verdict in favor of defendants on ground that all counts of complaint were based on breaches of professional standards of care and plaintiff failed to present expert testimony as to applicable standard of care; whether all counts of complaint summarily could be characterized as one general claim of professional negligence; whether court improperly concluded that plaintiff's failure to tender expert witness resulted in lack of evidence on professional standards of care; whether jury had before it testimony from which it could have inferred that standards of care were breached by defendants; whether court improperly granted motions for special finding, pursuant to statute (§ 52-226a), that action was brought without merit and in bad faith.

Pritsker v. Keating (Memorandum Decision) 901

Propel Financial I, LLC v. Ortiz (Memorandum Decision). 901

Puff v. Puff 103

Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motions for modification of alimony and contempt; whether trial court erred in concluding that parties' oral agreement was enforceable, binding agreement; claim that trial court improperly modified oral agreement when reducing terms to written decision; whether trial court improperly failed to canvass plaintiff pursuant to statute (§ 46b-66); whether trial court improperly granted motion for contempt; whether plaintiff wilfully violated court order.

Ray v. Ray 544

Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motion for order; motion to reargue; claim that plaintiff failed to provide adequate record for review of claims on appeal; claim that trial court erred by entering order establishing defendant's child support obligation without making finding as to defendant's net income; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly relied on unsworn child support guidelines

<i>worksheet in making certain findings; claim that trial court erred by failing to take into account defendant's income in excess of his base salary in determining his child support obligation; whether court's order complied with state regulations (§ 46b-215a-1 et seq.) pertaining to child support and arrearage guidelines; whether trial court abused its discretion by ordering presumptive minimum amount of child support under child support guidelines and declining to enter supplemental order based on defendant's deferred compensation income; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying relief requested by plaintiff in motion to reargue.</i>	
Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Speer	1
<i>Writ of error; claim that receivership was void because trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over foreclosure action; whether plaintiff in error rebutted presumption that defendant in error, as holder of notes, had standing to commence foreclosure actions; whether trial court improperly granted motions for order of payment with respect to receiver of rents; whether receiver of rents had obligation to collect and account for rents for properties; whether trial court abused discretion in denying motions to reargue; whether findings of fact by trial court were clearly erroneous; whether doctrine of judicial estoppel applied to bar claim for order of payment.</i>	
Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Spear (See Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Speer) . . .	1
Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. 76-78 Truman Street, LLC (See Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Speer)	1
Smith v. Redding	283
<i>Public nuisance; reviewability of claim that trial court abused its discretion by excluding evidence of subsequent remedial measures by defendant town; failure of plaintiff to provide complete record of trial proceedings; reviewability of claim that trial court failed to instruct jury on applicable zoning regulations as safety standard.</i>	
Spencer v. Spencer	504
<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly construed term "cohabitation" in dissolution judgment as not requiring evidence of romantic or sexual relationship; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting defendant's motion for termination of alimony based on cohabitation; whether trial court's finding that plaintiff cohabitated within meaning of statute (§ 46b-86 [b]) was clearly erroneous; claim that defendant sought termination of alimony with unclean hands based on wilful nonpayment of alimony; whether trial court abused its discretion in modifying alimony; whether finding that defendant experienced substantial change in financial circumstances was clearly erroneous; whether defendant met his burden of proving that reduction of income was not result of neglect or culpable conduct; whether amount by which trial court modified defendant's alimony obligation was proportionate to decrease in his income; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's motions for contempt.</i>	
State v. Cuadrado (Memorandum Decision)	901
State v. Hall-Davis	211
<i>Murder; conspiracy to commit murder; criminal possession of firearm; whether trial court properly declined to instruct jury on theory of defense of others; whether evidence supported finding that victim was at imminent risk of great bodily harm; whether preemptive strike is justified under defense of others theory; whether defendant met burden of showing that it would have been objectively reasonable for him to believe that victim was at imminent risk of having great bodily harm inflicted on her; unpreserved claim that trial court improperly restricted defense counsel from arguing defense of others and renunciation of criminal purpose during closing argument; whether defendant demonstrated that alleged constitutional violation existed and deprived him of fair trial; whether defendant was entitled to relief under plain error doctrine; whether defendant waived claim that trial court gave jury faulty and misleading instruction on conspiracy when he had meaningful opportunity to review instruction but failed to object.</i>	
State v. Hathaway	279
<i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court improperly dismissed motion to correct illegal sentence for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that sentence of twenty-five years of incarceration for murder imposed upon juvenile violated prohibition in eighth amendment to United States constitution against cruel and unusual punishment; claim that sentence of twenty-five years of incar-</i>	

ceration for murder imposed upon juvenile violated article first, §§ 8 and 9, of state constitution.

State v. Lopez 651

Operating motor vehicle while under influence of alcohol in violation of statute (§ 14-227a [a] [1]); operating motor vehicle while license suspended; whether trial court abused its discretion in sustaining objections to defendant's attempts on cross-examination to question state's expert witness regarding his lack of knowledge as to defendant's blood alcohol content level; whether defendant met burden of demonstrating that trial court's undue restriction on cross-examination of state's expert was harmful; whether evidence of defendant's blood alcohol content can be admitted where defendant charged under behavioral subdivision of § 14-227a; whether there was substantial question regarding scientific reliability of expert's opinion evidence; claim that trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence DVD that contained video of traffic stop; reviewability of unrepresented claim that admission of DVD was improper on ground that it was incomplete or potentially altered; whether unrepresented claim was evidentiary in nature; whether admission of DVD constituted plain error; whether DVD was sufficiently authenticated.

State v. Redmond 129

Writ of error; whether trial court improperly ordered forfeiture of seized property pursuant to statute (§ 54-36a [c]); claim that § 54-36a (c) applied only to seized contraband and certain cash linked to illegal drug transactions, and not to firearms; whether trial court's determination that requisite nexus existed between seized firearms and narcotics business of defendant in underlying criminal matter was supported by record; claim that trial court should have conducted in rem forfeiture proceedings pursuant to statute ([Rev. to 2013] § 54-33g) in order to effectuate forfeiture of seized firearms; claim that trial court improperly entered forfeiture order without providing plaintiff in error with notice and opportunity to be heard, in violation of in rem forfeiture procedures set forth in § 54-33g; whether § 54-36a (c) requires court or state to provide formal notice to any individual that may have interest in seized property that is to be forfeited; failure of plaintiff in error to file timely motion for return of seized property during pendency of criminal action pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 41-13).

State v. Rivera 242

Motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court improperly dismissed motion to correct illegal sentence for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that twenty-five year mandatory minimum sentence without possibility of parole for juvenile homicide offender was unconstitutional under eighth amendment to United States constitution, as interpreted by Miller v. Alabama (567 U.S. 460); whether sentencing court was required to consider juvenile offender's youth and attendant characteristics as mitigating factors prior to sentencing juvenile homicide offender to life without possibility of parole where defendant was now eligible for parole; claim that mandatory minimum sentence of twenty-five years of incarceration without possibility of parole imposed on juvenile homicide offender was unconstitutional under article first, §§ 8 and 9, of state constitution; whether factors set forth in State v. Geisler (222 Conn. 672) to be considered in defining scope and parameters of state constitution supported defendant's state constitutional claim; whether mandatory minimum sentence of twenty-five years of incarceration imposed on juvenile offender constituted cruel and unusual punishment under federal precedent; reviewability of unrepresented claim that trial court committed constitutional error when it improperly accepted defendant's waiver, through counsel, of right to presentence investigation report without canvassing defendant prior to permitting waiver; failure to raise claim in motion to correct illegal sentence.

State v. Stonick 181

Larceny in sixth degree; illegal use of credit card; whether trial court improperly noted entry of nolle prosequi over defendant's objection and request for dismissal when there was no allegation by state that any material witness had died, disappeared or become disabled, or that material evidence had disappeared or had been destroyed and that further investigation was necessary, as required by statute (§ 54-56b).

State v. Taylor 18

Murder; robbery in first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; hindering prosecution; tampering with physical evidence; claim that evidence was insufficient to support conviction of murder, robbery in first degree and conspir-

acy to commit robbery in first degree; claim that, because there was no evidence that robbery had occurred, there was no proof of robbery or conspiracy to commit robbery or of murder under doctrine of Pinkerton v. United States (328 U.S. 640); whether trial court abused discretion by granting motion to disqualify defendant's first court-appointed counsel; whether defendant, who was indigent, had right to select appointed counsel; whether it was permissible for court to change appointed counsel when potential conflict of interest existed; whether defendant was prejudiced by disqualification of appointed counsel.

State v. Thomas 369

Sexual assault in first degree; unlawful restraint in first degree; false statement in second degree; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional rights to confrontation and to present defense when it ruled that rape shield statute (§ 54-86f [a]) prohibited him from introducing evidence of victim's prior sexual conduct; claim that evidence of victim's prior sexual conduct was admissible to impeach her credibility pursuant to exceptions to § 54-86f (a); whether victim testified, either explicitly or by reasonable inference, about her sexual conduct with anyone other than defendant such that evidence of her prior sexual conduct was admissible for impeachment purposes under § 54-86f (a) (2); whether impeaching victim's credibility with evidence of her prior sexual conduct, and with inconsistent statement she had made to hospital nurse, was so relevant and material, pursuant to § 54-86f (a) (4), that its exclusion violated defendant's constitutional rights; reviewability of unpreserved claim that evidence of victim's prior sexual conduct should have been admitted, pursuant to § 54-86f (a) (1), to show alternative source for scrapes and bruises on victim's body after sexual assault; reviewability of unpreserved claim that defendant was improperly prohibited from inquiring and presenting evidence about victim's relationship with another man in order to show victim's motive and bias to lie; whether unpreserved claim was of constitutional magnitude for purposes of review pursuant to State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233); whether evidence of victim's prior sexual conduct was probative, pursuant to § 54-86f (a) (1), of whether her vaginal injuries could have been caused by anyone other than defendant; claim that trial court abused its discretion by denying motion for funds to pay for investigative services for defense; whether trial court had discretion to grant request for funds; whether defendant failed to make proper showing that funds for investigative services were reasonable and necessary to defense; claim that defendant was denied right to fair trial as result of prosecutorial impropriety; whether comments of prosecutor demeaned or impugned integrity of defense counsel; whether prosecutor improperly appealed to jurors' emotions or referred to facts or documents that were not in evidence; reviewability of claim that prosecutor improperly vouched for victim's credibility; failure to brief claim adequately.

Toccaline v. Commissioner of Correction 480

Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly granted motion to dismiss third petition for writ of habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal as to claims of actual innocence, due process violation where prosecutor was alleged to have unknowingly presented false testimony at criminal trial, and that habeas court improperly dismissed claim that first habeas appellate counsel was ineffective; whether habeas court improperly dismissed claim that first habeas appellate counsel was ineffective on ground that claim was successive; whether claim that first habeas appellate counsel was ineffective lacked merit; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying certification to appeal as to assertion that counsel in second habeas trial rendered ineffective assistance.

U.S. Bank National Assn., Trustee v. Blowers 622

Foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly granted motion to strike special defenses and counterclaims; whether trial court properly determined that special defenses did not relate to making, validity or enforcement of subject note and mortgage; whether transaction test set forth in rule of practice (§ 10-10) applied to special defenses; whether allegations in counterclaims were sufficient to establish that counterclaims had reasonable nexus to making, validity or enforcement of note or mortgage pursuant to transaction test; request for this court to adopt transaction test that did not include requirement that special defenses and counterclaims have reasonable nexus to, or relate to, making, validity or enforcement of note or mortgage; claim that trial court erred in its interpretation of scope of term enforcement; whether trial court erred in finding that no binding loan modification existed between parties.

Williams v. Commissioner of Correction 321
Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; whether habeas court properly rejected claim that petitioner’s trial counsel was ineffective in failing to challenge state’s medical evidence by consulting and calling rebuttal medical expert witness; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner failed to prove that trial counsel was ineffective by failing to present testimony of witness to support potential defense of physical incapability.

Yashenko v. Commissioner of Correction 740
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly denied petition for writ of habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to convey to state petitioner’s acceptance of plea offer; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to prevent plea offer from lapsing; adoption of trial court’s memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.

Zhang v. 56 Locust Road, LLC 420
Quiet title; claim that trial court improperly found in plaintiffs’ favor on claim of adverse possession; claim that trial court improperly granted defendant easement by necessity.