Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 178

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Akpan *v.* Etim (Memorandum Decision) 904
Baronio *v.* Stubbs 769
Child custody; claim that trial court erred in presuming shared physical custody was in child's best interest where there was no agreement by defendant to award of joint legal custody; claim that trial court committed plain error by stating during pendente lite proceedings that it wanted to see increase in plaintiff's parenting time and indicating before it heard certain evidence that it was inclined to award joint legal custody to plaintiff; whether trial court properly concluded under circumstances of case that parties had agreed upon award of joint legal custody and that shared physical custody was in best interest of child; whether record revealed any apparent bias or predetermination by trial court against defendant or in favor of plaintiff.
Beck & Beck, LLC *v.* Costello 112
Action to recover unpaid legal fees; whether trial court properly dismissed amended counterclaims and cross claims on ground that defendant lacked standing to bring them where counterclaims and cross claims existed prior to date on which defendant filed bankruptcy petition and defendant failed to list them on schedule of personal property in bankruptcy proceeding; whether trial court properly concluded that bankruptcy estate owned amended counterclaims and cross claims; whether bankruptcy trustee abandoned amended counterclaims and cross claims.
Carmon *v.* Commissioner of Correction 356
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner was not denied due process as result of state's failure to turn over to his criminal trial counsel allegedly exculpatory evidence that consisted of fingerprint analysis report; whether fingerprint analysis report constituted material, exculpatory evidence under Brady *v.* Maryland *(373 U.S. 83); claim that habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner failed to prove that criminal trial counsel and prior habeas counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to investigate or to present fingerprint analysis report; whether petitioner could establish that he was prejudiced by alleged deficiency of counsel; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner failed to establish claim of actual innocence; claim that fingerprint analysis report was newly discovered evidence.*
Casillo *v.* Gomez (Memorandum Decision) 903
Chase Home Finance, LLC *v.* Scroggin 727
Foreclosure; default for failure to plead; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for judgment of strict foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly failed to give effect to answer to amended complaint filed by defendant homeowner, who previously was defaulted for failure to plead to original complaint; whether filing of amended complaint following finding of default effectively extinguished default and afforded homeowner opportunity to plead in response to amended complaint five years after default was entered; whether amended complaint significantly amended original complaint to allege new material factual allegations and new legal theories; whether it was inequitable for trial court not to have considered default entered against homeowner to have been extinguished.
Crocker *v.* Commissioner of Correction 191
Habeas corpus; mootness; claim that incarcerated petitioner's placement in administrative segregation following fight with another inmate was illegal under terms of certain administrative directives of Department of Correction; whether appeal was moot; whether this court could afford petitioner any practical relief when, during pendency of appeal, petitioner was released from administrative segregation and transferred to out-of-state correctional facility, and petitioner's sole claim for habeas relief was to be released from administrative segregation.
Cuozzo *v.* Orange 647
Personal injury; claim that municipal defendants were liable under municipal liability statute (§ 52-557n) for injuries and damages plaintiff sustained when

his vehicle struck pothole in private driveway; whether trial court properly granted defendants' motions for summary judgment on ground that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether pothole was located in private driveway.

Cusano *v.* Lajoie 605

Negligence; personal injury; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting motion for additur; whether jury's award of medical expenses required it to find that plaintiff suffered compensable pain throughout period of medical treatment; failure of trial court to identify any part of record that supported its reasoning or to provide any explanation for amount of additur; whether jury reasonably could have determined that plaintiff had not proven any noneconomic damages for pain and suffering, or damages for lost wages.

Dixon *v.* East Coast Music Mall (Memorandum Decision) 901

Frauenglass & Associates, LLC *v.* Enagbare 35

Contracts; action to recover unpaid legal fees; whether claims regarding attorney's fees charged by plaintiff in underlying dissolution proceeding constituted improper collateral attack on underlying judgment; reviewability of claim of newly discovered evidence of fraudulent conduct by plaintiff; failure to file motion to open underlying judgment on basis of fraud; reviewability of claim made for first time on appeal.

GMAC Mortgage, LLC *v.* Ford 287

Foreclosure; standing; claim that trial court erred in granting substitute plaintiff's motion to open judgment of strict foreclosure for purpose of setting new law days and denying named defendant's motion to open judgment; whether named defendant's purported rescission of subject loan was effective under Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.); whether Jesinoski *v.* Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. *(135 S. Ct. 709) was applicable to facts of case; claim that substitute plaintiff lacked standing to maintain action.*

Geci *v.* Boor 585

Probate appeals; whether trial court properly determined that plaintiff became sole owner of joint bank accounts upon decedent's death; claim that trial court committed clear error in failing to find that plaintiff fraudulently concealed survivorship rights on joint bank accounts; whether trial court properly reinstated plaintiff as executrix of decedent's estate; claim that plaintiff failed to perform adequately duties as executrix by undervaluing certain assets in inventory of decedent's estate.

Gomez *v.* Commissioner of Correction 519

Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner's due process rights were violated by state's suppression of material exculpatory evidence in violation of Brady *v.* Maryland *(373 U.S. 83) when state failed to disclose certain consideration that allegedly had been offered in exchange for the testimony of two witnesses; whether habeas court's finding that agreements existed between state and witnesses, and that agreements were limited to bringing their cooperation to attention of judicial authority posttrial was clearly erroneous; whether evidence supported habeas court's finding that state disclosed agreements; claim that state improperly failed to disclose impeachment evidence relating to how it had assisted in reducing bonds for witnesses; claim that state violated petitioner's rights to due process and fair trial when, during criminal trial, it knowingly presented, and failed to correct, false testimony of witnesses; whether state was required to correct allegedly false testimony of witnesses where petitioner failed to prove existence of undisclosed agreement or understanding; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner was not denied effective assistance of counsel as result of alleged failure of trial counsel to adequately cross-examine witnesses regarding their alleged agreements or understandings with state; whether petitioner failed to prove that he was prejudiced by trial counsel's allegedly deficient performance.*

Heyward *v.* Judicial Dept. 757

Employment discrimination; hostile work environment; race discrimination; motion to strike; claim that trial court improperly struck plaintiff employee's claims of hostile work environment and race discrimination; whether plaintiff employee pleaded sufficient facts to state claims for hostile work environment and race discrimination; whether conduct alleged in complaint was sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter conditions of plaintiff employees' employment and to create hostile work environment; whether complaint alleged sufficient facts to demonstrate that plaintiff employee had been subjected to adverse employment action by defendant employer.

Horvath *v.* Hartford 504
Summary judgment; alleged violation of state whistle-blower statute (§ 31-51m); whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment; reviewability of claim, raised for first time on appeal, that defendant's actions amounted to retaliatory penalty and discipline for plaintiff's having reported alleged abuses of authority; whether plaintiff's claims were limited to those alleged in complaint; whether there was genuine issue of material fact as to whether plaintiff was constructively discharged as result of whistle-blowing actions in violation of § 31-51m.
Housing Authority *v.* Rodriguez 120
Summary process; motion to dismiss; claim that the trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction because plaintiff failed to provide defendant tenant with pretermination notice as required by statute (§ 47a-15) prior to serving notice to quit; whether pretermination notice served four months prior to service of notice to quit was valid where, pursuant to § 47a-15, substantially same act or omission for which notice to quit was given recurred within six months; whether plaintiff could terminate agreement without serving second pretermination notice; claim that informal meeting with plaintiff's director conclusively resolved question of whether plaintiff could evict defendant on basis of first pretermination notice such that second notice was required pursuant to certain federal regulations.
In re Damian G. 220
Termination of parental rights; whether trial court's finding that respondent mother failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage belief that, at some future date, she could assume responsible position in lives of her children was clearly erroneous; whether trial court reasonably could have found from evidence that mother had not gained insight regarding issues of domestic violence; whether evidence supported court's findings that it was not clear whether mother had, or could maintain, adequate or sufficient income or housing; whether there was ample evidentiary basis to support court's finding, by clear and convincing evidence, that mother's level of rehabilitation fell short and that children's need for permanency and stability ultimately should prevail; whether evidence supported trial court's finding that extent of deficiencies that continued to exist at time of trial reflected that mother was unable to benefit from continued parenting education; whether isolated error of trial court in its assessment of mother's insights into issues of domestic violence undermined court's findings as whole; claim that because several of trial court's subordinate factual findings in dispositional phase of proceeding were clearly erroneous, court's finding that termination of mother's parental rights was in best interests of children could not stand; whether mother demonstrated that any of trial court's factual findings were clearly erroneous.
In re Jacob W. 195
Termination of parental rights; whether trial court improperly concluded that maternal grandmother failed to prove lack of ongoing parent-child relationship by clear and convincing evidence; whether trial court applied incorrect legal test for determining whether there was ongoing parent-child relationship pursuant to applicable statute (§ 45a-717 [g] [2] [C]); whether trial court's inquiry should have focused foremost on whether children presently had positive feelings toward respondent father; whether trial court improperly focused inquiry on actions that father undertook to maintain relationship with children, pursuant to exception that applies where custodian has unreasonably interfered with noncustodial parent's visitation or other efforts to maintain ongoing parent-child relationship such that custodian's unreasonable interference leads inevitably to lack of ongoing parent-child relationship; whether it is only if child possesses no present positive feelings for parent, or if infant child's present feelings cannot be ascertained, that court may turn to question of interference; whether trial court could not logically have concluded both that ongoing parent-child relationship existed and that unreasonable interference inevitably prevented father from maintaining ongoing parent-child relationship; whether, even if trial court's application of test for determining whether there was ongoing parent-child relationship was legally and logically correct, court's decision could not stand where court made inconsistent findings by clear and convincing evidence both that there was interference and that there was no evidence of interference.
Ionescu *v.* Stratford (Memorandum Decision) 903
Isenburg *v.* Isenburg 805
Contracts; claim that trial court erred by excluding large portions of exhibits plaintiff offered into evidence at trial; claim that trial court erred by not recusing itself

sua sponte from case; claim that trial court erred by finding there was no express or implied contract between plaintiff and defendant; claim that trial court erred by finding that defendant did not owe plaintiff any fiduciary duty; claim that trial court erred by failing to award plaintiff specific damages and property; claim that trial judge, as married man, was biased against plaintiff because she was living with defendant as unmarried couple.

James *v.* Blackburn (Memorandum Decision) 901

Kellman *v.* Commissioner of Correction 63

Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to meaningfully present and explain pretrial plea offer from state; whether habeas court's finding that petitioner failed to demonstrate that he was prejudiced by counsel's allegedly deficient performance during pretrial plea negotiations was clearly erroneous; credibility of witnesses; whether petitioner established that it was reasonably probable that he would have accepted plea offer; whether habeas court improperly determined that petitioner failed to establish claim that trial counsel was ineffective by employing deficient trial strategy that pursued extreme emotional disturbance defense at trial, without consulting with expert on that defense prior to trial; whether habeas court's finding that trial counsel's decision not to retain expert witness in pursuing extreme emotional disturbance defense was reasonable strategic decision was clearly erroneous; whether petitioner demonstrated that he was prejudiced by trial counsel's allegedly deficient performance in pursuing extreme emotional disturbance defense without consulting with expert witness.

Kent *v.* DiPaola 424

Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court improperly failed to include pensions in division of parties' marital property; whether trial court improperly failed to credit testimony of pension actuary as to present value of pensions; whether trial court properly valued or distributed pensions; claim that trial court abused its discretion in its division of marital home; claim that trial court should have made distribution of marital property more clear or placed specific values on its determinations; whether trial court abused its discretion in its division of marital estate; claim that trial court failed to account adequately for factors in statute (§ 46b-81) governing distribution of assets.

Law Offices of Frank N. Peluso, P.C. *v.* Cotrone 415

Contracts; action for unpaid legal fees; withdrawal of action; whether withdrawal of withdrawal of action was proper pleading to restore action to docket; claim that trial court abused its discretion in restoring plaintiff's action to docket following withdrawal of action in absence of timely filed motion to restore under statute (§ 52-212a); whether trial court improperly treated electronic notation on docket list as erasure of plaintiff's withdrawal of action and restoration of action to docket; claim that trial court exercised direct authority over case and implicitly restored plaintiff's action following plaintiff's withdrawal of withdrawal of action.

Lawrence *v.* Dept. of Energy & Environmental Protection 615

Administrative appeal; whether trial court improperly dismissed administrative appeal from decision by Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection that granted application to construct residential dock and pier; claim that trial court improperly concluded that plaintiff was not classically aggrieved; claim that trial court improperly concluded that plaintiff was aggrieved pursuant to statute (§ 22a-19) only with respect to claim of visual degradation; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.

Lebron *v.* Commissioner of Correction 299

Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly dismissed third habeas petition on ground that there was no good cause for trial as to any count of petition; whether habeas court properly determined that claims raised in first three counts of habeas petition were waived as result of petitioner's guilty plea; whether habeas court properly dismissed fourth count of habeas petition as improper successive petition; claim that petitioner did not have full and fair opportunity to present claim in first habeas matter; whether habeas court improperly determined that there was no good cause to allow entirety of fifth and sixth counts to proceed to trial; whether habeas court's conclusion that none of petitioner's claims had direct relationship to validity of plea itself was improper; whether habeas court properly dismissed those portions of counts five and six that were premised on alleged ineffective assistance of counsel regarding claims that were asserted in counts

one through three of habeas petition, which had been waived by petitioner's guilty plea.

Meier *v.* Meier (Memorandum Decision) 903

Meletrich *v.* Commissioner of Correction 266

Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal with respect to claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to call additional alibi witness during petitioner's criminal trial; whether habeas court properly determined that trial counsel was not deficient in failing to call additional alibi witness; whether petitioner was prejudiced by decision of trial counsel not to call additional alibi witness.

O'Brien *v.* New Haven. 469

Indemnification; action by plaintiff former municipal employee seeking indemnification against defendant municipality pursuant to statute (§ 7-101a); claim that indemnification action brought in 2015 was untimely because underlying tortious conduct occurred in 2010 and § 7-101a (d) required employee to give notice to defendant within six months of when "cause of action has accrued" and within two years of when the "cause of action therefor arose"; whether cause of action for indemnification accrued when plaintiff first could have successfully held defendant liable for expenses that incurred in underlying action, which could not have occurred until the underlying action was resolved in plaintiff's favor; whether plaintiff's notice and action filed within six months of date that underlying action was resolved were timely pursuant to § 7-101a (d); claim that § 7-101a authorized reimbursement of plaintiff's expenses incurred prosecuting present indemnification action against defendant.

Picard *v.* Guilford House, LLC 134

Writ of error; challenge to financial sanctions imposed on plaintiff in error for attorney misconduct; claim that imposition of sanctions was barred by res judicata and collateral estoppel because statewide grievance committee already acted on matter by issuing reprimand to plaintiff in error; claim that underlying defendants should have been collaterally estopped from seeking court imposed sanctions because they were in privity with statewide grievance committee; whether trial court abused its discretion in amount of sanctions imposed; claim that amount of sanctions imposed was not proportional to misconduct.

Rockwell *v.* Rockwell 373

Vexatious litigation; breach of contract; motion to bifurcate; whether trial court abuse its discretion in bifurcating trial of issue of probable cause from issues of malice and damages; claim that trial court, in deciding issue of probable cause, violated plaintiff's state constitutional right to jury trial; failure to provide this court with complete analysis of factors set forth in State *v.* Geisler *(222 Conn. 672); whether existence of probable cause in vexatious litigation action is ultimately to be determined by trial court; claim that trial court improperly concluded that plaintiff failed to meet his burden of proving that defendant attorney lacked probable cause to prosecute underlying breach of contract action; whether record contained undisputed facts known by defendant attorney when breach of contract action was instituted on which reasonable attorney familiar with Connecticut law would have believed that lawful grounds for prosecuting that action existed.*

Rosenthal *v.* Bloomfield 258

Breach of contract; claim that trial court erred in granting motion for judgment of dismissal pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 15-8); whether evidence submitted set forth prima facie case of breach of contract; whether plaintiffs demonstrated, in accordance with Poole *v.* Waterbury *(266 Conn. 68), that insurance benefits under new health insurance plan in employment agreement were not substantially commensurate to benefits under prior plan when viewing group of plaintiffs as whole.*

Salmon *v.* Commissioner of Correction. 695

Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner failed to establish that pretrial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to advise petitioner of second eyewitness' existence during pretrial plea negotiations; whether habeas court's factual finding that counsel must have informed petitioner of second eyewitness' existence was clearly erroneous; whether case had to be remanded for new trial; reviewability of claim that petitioner was prejudiced by performance of pretrial counsel where habeas court never addressed issue of prejudice.

Samakaab *v.* Dept. of Social Services. 52

Employment discrimination; claim that defendant discriminated against plaintiff on basis of age, sex, national origin and prior opposition to unlawful employment practices in violation of Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act (§ 46a-51 et seq.); whether trial court properly determined that insufficient facts were presented to support prima facie case of discrimination or retaliation; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.

Sovereign Bank *v.* Licata 82

Foreclosure; mootness; appellate jurisdiction; whether this court lacked subject matter jurisdiction and appeal was moot because defendant's interest in property had been extinguished after law days passed; whether there was any practical relief that could be afforded to defendant; whether foreclosure judgment had been stayed by appeal from counterclaim; whether initial appellate stay of execution that arose when foreclosure judgment was rendered expired after appeal period for that judgment had run; whether there was appellate stay in effect with respect to foreclosure judgment when law days began to run; whether absolute title to property transferred to plaintiff as matter of law after all law days expired; whether final judgment disposing of counterclaim is separate and distinct from judgment on associated complaint; whether foreclosure judgment gave rise to distinct appeal period and appellate stay that was not affected by stay that resulted due to appeal from judgment on counterclaim.

State *v.* Azevedo 671

Arson in first degree; attempt to commit insurance fraud; attempt to commit larceny in first degree; conspiracy to commit arson in first degree; conspiracy to commit insurance fraud; conspiracy to commit larceny in first degree; whether trial court improperly admitted into evidence coconspirator's statements to investigator and deposition testimony in related civil matter under § 8-3 (1) (D) of Connecticut Code of Evidence as statements of coconspirator in furtherance of conspiracy; whether statements and deposition testimony were testimonial in nature; whether defendant's right of confrontation was implicated by admission of statements and testimony; whether it was clearly erroneous for trial court to conclude that state had proven existence of conspiracy by fair preponderance of evidence so as to permit jury to consider deposition testimony and statements of coconspirator as evidence of continuing conspiracy under § 8-3 (1) (D); whether trial court improperly admitted into evidence coconspirator's statements to police as dual inculpatory statements under § 8-6 (4) of Connecticut Code of Evidence; reviewability of unpreserved claim that state's use of cell site location information pertaining to defendant's phone records violated article first, § 7, of state constitution.

State *v.* Bialowas 179

Manslaughter in second degree; evasion of responsibility in operation of motor vehicle in violation of statute ([Rev. to 2009] § 14-224 [a]); claim that trial court committed plain error by failing to instruct jury sua sponte that defendant's reasonable fear of harm from victim would be possible defense to charge pursuant to § 14-224 (a); whether defendant's claim involved error so obvious that it affected fairness of or public confidence in judicial proceeding; whether defendant demonstrated failure to instruct was so harmful or prejudicial that it resulted in manifest injustice necessitating reversal.

State *v.* Davis. 324

Accessory to murder; conspiracy to commit murder; attempt to commit murder; claim that trial court committed plain error by improperly instructing jury on accessory to murder that state did not need to prove that defendant had specific intent to kill; whether trial court properly instructed jury that it did not have to find that defendant had specific intent to kill particular victim in order to find defendant guilty of murder as accessory.

State *v.* Eddie N. C. 147

Risk of injury to child; sexual assault in first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion by admitting, under applicable rule of evidence (§ 4-5 [b]), prior uncharged sexual misconduct evidence; claim that prior uncharged sexual misconduct evidence was too remote in time to be admissible in light of twelve year gap between uncharged and charged sexual misconduct; whether uncharged sexual misconduct evidence was sufficiently similar to conduct with which defendant was charged; whether victim of prior uncharged sexual misconduct was sufficiently similar to victim in present case; whether trial court abused its

discretion by admitting victim's statements to her mother and to health care providers pursuant to exception in rule against hearsay for statements reasonably pertinent to obtaining medical diagnosis or treatment; harmless error; unpreserved claim that trial court committed plain error by admitting opinions of medical providers that victim had been sexually assaulted; unpreserved claim that medical providers' improper vouching for victim's credibility constituted plain error; whether any evidentiary impropriety resulted in manifest injustice requiring reversal of judgment.

State *v.* Fowler 332

Revocation of probation; whether trial court's finding that defendant violated conditions of probation by failing to keep probation officers informed of whereabouts and failing to provide probation officers with valid and verifiable address was clearly erroneous; claim that office of probation did not have authority to require defendant to submit to global positioning system monitoring; whether defendant's refusal to submit to monitoring constituted violation of conditions of probation; reviewability of claim that trial court erred in denying oral motion to dismiss; failure to brief claim adequately.

State *v.* Fuller 575

Conspiracy to steal firearm; conspiracy to commit larceny in fourth degree; conspiracy to commit burglary in third degree; illegal manufacture, distribution, sale, prescription or administration of narcotics by person who is not drug-dependent; illegal manufacture, distribution, sale, prescription or administration of narcotics by person who is not drug-dependent within 1500 feet of public elementary school; conspiracy to commit illegal manufacture, distribution, sale, prescription or administration of narcotics by person who is not drug-dependent; criminal possession of firearm; reviewability of claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional rights to counsel, fair trial and due process in denying requests to personally possess copy of discovery items disclosed by state; whether unpreserved claim that trial court improperly denied requests for defendant to personally possess discovery items was of constitutional magnitude; whether criminal defendant has general constitutional right to discovery; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying discovery requests for defendant to personally possess copy of discovery items disclosed by state.

State *v.* Garcia 557

Writ of error; bail; whether trial court applied correct legal standard in ruling on motion by bail bonds company that sought discharge from its obligation under bond executed to obtain release of criminal defendant from custody pending trial; whether bail bonds company established good cause pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 38-23) to be relieved of obligation on bond; whether criminal defendant's immigration status constituted act of law sufficient to relieve bail bonds company from obligation for good cause shown; claim that promise by state of Connecticut to seek to extradite criminal defendant after he absconded was relevant to court's determination of whether bail bonds company had demonstrated good cause to discharge its obligation.

State *v.* Gill 43

Murder; sufficiency of evidence; claim that state presented insufficient evidence to prove that defendant intended to cause victim's death; consciousness of guilt evidence.

State *v.* Jackson 16

Murder; claim that trial court committed plain error in failing to give special accomplice credibility instruction regarding testimony of two witnesses; whether defendant failed to establish indisputable instructional error on part of trial court that was so clear and obvious as to require extraordinary remedy of reversal, as required under first prong of plain error doctrine; whether claim failed second prong of plain error doctrine because it did not result in manifest injustice; whether jury was presumed to have followed trial court's instructions.

State *v.* Johnson 490

Robbery in second degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in second degree; sufficiency of evidence; plain error doctrine; claim that there was insufficient evidence to sustain conviction because it was based on uncorroborated accomplice testimony; whether this court was bound by Supreme Court precedent on issue of uncorroborated accomplice testimony; whether defendant could prevail under plain error doctrine on unpreserved claim that trial court improperly failed to provide adequate cautionary instruction to jury regarding dangers of relying on uncorroborated accomplice testimony; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting

into evidence certain witness' statement to police; whether statement satisfied personal knowledge requirement under State *v.* Whelan *(200 Conn. 743).*

State *v.* Manning (Memorandum Decision). 902

State *v.* Myers 102

Murder; reviewability of claim that defendant was harmed by trial court's improper exclusion from evidence of video interview of witness who was unavailable to testify where claim was raised for first time in reply brief; claim that harm resulting from court's allegedly erroneous ruling was implicit in defendant's principal brief such that defendant did not need to brief and analyze harmfulness of ruling in principal brief.

State *v.* Petitt. 443

Sale of narcotics; claim that trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence cocaine from second and third sales of drugs from defendant to undercover police officer because only police officer that saw drug transaction could not authenticate drugs; whether trial court could have determined with reasonable probability, based on chain of custody, that content of evidence was in substantially same condition as when offense was committed; claim that evidence was inadmissible unless it is either unique or distinguishable on its own or first officer to encounter evidence puts distinguishing mark on it; whether trial court committed plain error in admitting into evidence cocaine from first sale between defendant and undercover officer.

State *v.* Ramos 400

*Murder; sufficiency of evidence; credibility of witnesses; claim that trial court improperly failed to suppress evidence of defendant's post-*Miranda *silence in violation of constitutional right against self-incrimination; claim that admission of certain uncharged misconduct and past conviction evidence constituted plain error; claim that prosecutor's use of excessive leading questions during cross-examination of defendant constituted prosecutorial impropriety that deprived defendant of his right to due process.*

State *v.* Smith 715

Probation; claim that, pursuant to statute (§ 53a-32 [c]), trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss violation of probation charge because hearing on charge did not occur within 120 days of defendant's arraignment; claim that language of § 53a-32 (c) established mandatory time period in which probation violation hearing must occur, and state failed to establish good cause for extending time period; whether 120 day limitation in § 53a-32 (c) was jurisdictional in nature; whether evidence was insufficient to prove that defendant operated motor vehicle while his driver's license was under suspension in violation of statute (§ 14-215 [a]); failure of state to produce evidence that Department of Motor Vehicles mailed notice of suspension to defendant's last known address, which is necessary element for violation of § 14-215 (a).

State *v.* Stallworth (Memorandum Decision). 901

State *v.* Stanley (Memorandum Decision) 903

State *v.* Torres 29

Murder; claim that certain portions of trial court's instruction to jury on reasonable doubt constituted plain error; claim that cumulative effect of subject portions of instruction constituted plain error; whether Appellate Court was bound by Supreme Court precedent.

State *v.* Wade 459

Sale of narcotics by person who is not drug-dependent; possession of narcotics with intent to sell by person who is not drug-dependent; manslaughter in first degree; whether trial court improperly denied motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that the trial court improperly concluded that resentencing did not give rise to double jeopardy violation; claim that defendant had expectation of finality in sentence originally imposed for narcotics offenses that were not reversed on direct appeal; whether, when defendant successfully challenges one portion of sentencing package, trial court may resentence defendant on conviction of other crimes under aggregate package theory without offending double jeopardy clause.

State *v.* Walker. 345

Murder; conspiracy to commit murder; robbery in first degree; criminal possession of firearm; whether trial court committed plain error by failing, sua sponte, to instruct jury on accomplice testimony; whether evidence supported conclusion that girlfriend of defendant's coconspirator aided defendant in commission of any crime with which defendant was charged so as to warrant accomplice instruction.

Stephen J. R. *v.* Commissioner of Correction 1

Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; claim that habeas court improperly denied petition for certification to appeal after erroneously concluding that trial counsel had provided effective assistance despite decision not to consult with and present testimony of expert on false memory syndrome in child sexual assault cases.

Tara S. *v.* Charles J. 547

Sexual assault; application for prejudgment remedy; motion to dismiss; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss application for prejudgment remedy and underlying action because applicable statute of limitations (§ 52-577d) was unconstitutional as applied to defendant; whether meaning of § 52-577d was plain and unambiguous; whether statute permitted plaintiff to bring action against defendant regardless of whether she had repressed memories of defendant's sexual assaults; whether § 52-577d implicated constitutionally protected conduct or property right of defendant; whether constitutional rights to speedy trial, confrontation and against double jeopardy applied only in criminal settings.

Toma *v.* Ceesay (Memorandum Decision) 902

Waterford *v.* Krijger (Memorandum Decision). 904

Weaving *v.* Commissioner of Correction 658

Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to present testimony from accident reconstruction expert; claim that prior habeas counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to advance claim that trial counsel was ineffective in failing to present testimony from accident reconstruction expert.

Wiederman *v.* Halpert 783

Breach of fiduciary duty; fraud; conversion; violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); judgment following default; motion to open; claim that plaintiff real estate investor did not have standing to assert claims against defendant who managed real estate investment and his wife on ground that injuries allegedly sustained by plaintiff were derivative of injuries to certain limited liability companies; whether allegations that companies were managed in manner that damaged plaintiff directly were sufficient to establish colorable claim of injury; claim that trial court committed plain error by failing to make explicit determinations as to legal sufficiency of plaintiff's claims and assuming that entry of default against defendants had conclusively established their liability; whether trial court committed plain error in finding defendant liable to plaintiff for fraud; whether trial court improperly found defendant liable to plaintiff for conversion; whether trial court committed patent, readily discernible or obvious error in awarding compensatory damages; whether trial court committed clear error in awarding plaintiff punitive damages in addition to attorney's fees and costs when award of punitive damages on claim of common-law fraud may include only attorney's fees and costs.

Williams *v.* Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision). 902