

**Cumulative Table of Cases  
Connecticut Appellate Reports  
Volume 182**

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

<p>Adams v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Administrative appeal; appeal from decision by defendant Commissioner of Motor Vehicles suspending plaintiff's motor vehicle operator's license; whether trial court improperly dismissed appeal; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as opinion of this court.</i></p> <p>Asia M. v. Geoffrey M. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Acknowledgment of paternity; child support; whether trial court erred in concluding that Ragin v. Lee (78 Conn. App. 848) provided fourth and independent ground to open acknowledgment of paternity, apart from statutory grounds of fraud, mistake of fact, and duress, as set forth in applicable statutory provision ([Rev. to 2011] § 46b-172 [a] [2]); whether trial court erred in determining that family support magistrate had inherent authority to open judgment of paternity on basis of best interests of child.</i></p> <p>Battistotti v. Suzanne A. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Child custody; whether trial court abused its discretion in failing to analyze whether plaintiff's visitation expenses warranted deviation from child support guidelines; claim that trial court abused its discretion in restricting plaintiff's parenting time with child to town of Greenwich.</i></p> <p>General Ins. Co. of America v. Okeke . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Declaratory judgment; insurance; action seeking declaratory judgment to determine whether insurer was obligated to defend and indemnify insureds in certain civil actions brought against them; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly determined that insurer had no duty to defend or indemnify insureds; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as statement of facts and applicable law on issues.</i></p> <p>Geoffrey M. v. Asia M. (See Asia M. v. Geoffrey M.) . . . . .</p> <p>Lewis v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .</p> <p>Peacock v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .</p> <p>Plainville v. Almost Home Animal Rescue &amp; Shelter, Inc. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Negligence per se; unjust enrichment; motion to strike; claim that trial court applied improper legal standard in ruling on motion to strike; whether trial court properly struck count of complaint alleging negligence per se; whether trial court correctly determined that plaintiffs were not among intended beneficiaries of applicable statute (§ 53-247 [a]); whether, as matter of law, plaintiffs could not rely on § 53-247 (a) as basis for maintaining negligence per se action against defendant; whether trial court properly struck count of complaint alleging unjust enrichment; whether plaintiffs could not avail themselves of action sounding in unjust enrichment in light of adequate statutory (§ 22-329a [h]) remedy.</i></p> <p>Reyher v. Finkeldey . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Contracts; real estate; whether trial court erroneously concluded that plaintiff met burden of proving that he procured buyer that was ready, willing and able to purchase defendant's property in accordance with terms of listing agreement where buyer was not ready, willing and able to close on property without fulfillment of certain financing and inspection contingencies.</i></p> <p>State v. Bennett . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly dismissed, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, postjudgment motions to dismiss information under which defendant was convicted where motions did not raise issues over which court had jurisdiction beyond defendant's sentencing date; whether trial court abused its discretion by denying portion of motion to correct illegal sentence that claimed defendant had been sentenced on basis of materially inaccurate information contained in presentence investigation report.</i></p> <p>State v. Brown . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Murder; criminal possession of firearm; claim that trial court committed plain error by providing inadequate jury instructions regarding eyewitness testimony and</i></p>	<p>165</p> <p>22</p> <p>40</p> <p>83</p> <p>22</p> <p>901</p> <p>55</p> <p>159</p> <p>71</p> <p>112</p>
--	---

identification reliability; whether defendant explained or demonstrated how trial court's alleged error was obvious, readily discernible or resulted in prejudice, or that manifest injustice occurred as result of alleged instructional omission; whether defendant established legal requirement for trial court, in absence of expert testimony or request from defendant for such instruction, to provide, sua sponte, additional instruction about eyewitness testimony reliability; whether defendant explained how such alleged omission resulted in prejudice; request for this court to exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to review and reverse defendant's conviction.

State v. Dijmarescu . . . . . 135

Breach of peace in second degree; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting defense counsel's motion to withdraw from representation; whether counsel complied with purpose of notice provision in rule of practice (§ 3-10 [a]) applicable to motion to withdraw; claim that motion to withdraw implicated sixth amendment right to counsel; claim that trial court improperly admitted evidence of prior uncharged misconduct; whether trial court violated defendant's right against self-incrimination by failing to canvass defendant to determine if decision to testify was intelligent and voluntary; request for this court to exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice.

State v. Hall . . . . . 103

Manslaughter in first degree; claim that trial court improperly failed to provide jury with instruction concerning defendant's lack of duty to retreat from scene of incident in violation of sixth amendment right to present defense; whether duty to retreat played part in defendant's criminal trial; whether defendant established existence of constitutional violation that deprived him of fair trial.

State v. Holmes . . . . . 124

Felony murder; home invasion; conspiracy to commit home invasion; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to correct illegal sentence on basis of its finding that defendant's sentence for felony murder had been predicated on defendant's conviction of burglary, which trial court had vacated on double jeopardy grounds; claim that when conviction of burglary in first degree was vacated, conviction of home invasion became predicate offense for felony murder, which violated federal and state constitutions because at time defendant committed offense of home invasion, it was not defined as predicate offense for felony murder in applicable statute (§ 53a-54c); whether fact that trial court vacated defendant's burglary conviction on double jeopardy grounds altered fact that it remained predicate offense for felony murder charge.

Ugalde v. Saint Mary's Hospital, Inc. . . . . 1

Medical malpractice; whether trial court erred in denying request for leave to amend complaint where request was filed after expiration of statute of limitations for wrongful death actions; whether trial court improperly dismissed action for lack of personal jurisdiction where complaint was supported by opinion letter from health care provider that was legally insufficient under statute (§ 52-190a [a]); whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to reargue denial of motion to set aside judgment of nonsuit.

White v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . . 188

Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner's right to due process was violated because guilty plea was not made knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily; claim that petitioner's trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to adequately research and investigate issue of petitioner's mental state at time of guilty plea and to bring information to trial court's attention; claim that medication petitioner was taking on day of guilty plea substantially impacted petitioner's ability to understand plea agreement and proceedings; whether habeas court erred in failing to find that petitioner's due process rights were violated; whether petitioner's guilty plea canvass was constitutionally sufficient; whether habeas court's findings were adequately supported by record; credibility of witnesses; whether habeas court erred in concluding that trial counsel did not render ineffective assistance; whether record showed reasonable probability that petitioner would have chosen to proceed to trial rather than plead guilty if trial counsel had further investigated petitioner's mental state or brought it to trial court's attention.