

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

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

<p><i>Adams v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles</i> . . . . .  <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>	165
<p><i>Asia M. v. Geoffrey M.</i> . . . . .  <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>	22
<p><i>Bank of New York Mellon v. Horsey</i> . . . . .  <i>Foreclosure; summary judgment; standing; claim that trial court improperly granted motion to open judgment of dismissal; whether record supported claim that court disregarded standard for opening disciplinary judgment set forth in applicable statute (§ 52-212) and rule of practice (§ 17-43); reviewability of unpreserved claims that trial court exhibited bias against defendant and that court improperly rendered judgment of strict foreclosure because substitute plaintiff failed to comply with five day notice provision of rule of practice (§ 23-18 [b]); whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment as to liability only; reviewability of claims that trial court abused its discretion by not dismissing action pursuant to rule of practice (§ 17-19) and that court improperly failed to give credence to bifurcation of subject note and mortgage; claim that trial court improperly failed to address whether substitute plaintiff had standing to prosecute foreclosure action; whether defendant failed to rebut presumption that substitute plaintiff had standing to prosecute action as holder of note and mortgage; claim that trial court ignored fraud perpetrated by substitute plaintiff.</i></p>	417
<p><i>Battistotti v. Suzanne A.</i> . . . . .  <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>	40
<p><i>Bennett v. Commissioner of Correction</i> . . . . .  <i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in declining to admit as full exhibit transcript of expert testimony presented at codefendant's criminal trial; claim that petitioner's trial counsel performed deficiently by inadequately challenging eyewitness testimony; whether habeas court erred by not taking judicial notice of transcript of expert testimony from codefendant's criminal trial; reviewability of unpreserved claim that habeas court should have admitted transcript of expert testimony from codefendant's criminal trial as full exhibit pursuant to residual exception to hearsay rule; whether habeas court erred in concluding on merits that petitioner's right to effective assistance of counsel was not violated; whether habeas court erred in its conclusion that petitioner's trial counsel did not perform deficiently by not moving to suppress in-court identification of petitioner by witness; claim that petitioner's trial counsel performed deficiently by not presenting expert on issue of eyewitness identification; claim that petitioner's trial counsel performed deficiently by not emphasizing, in course of cross-examination, several factors identified as important by our Supreme Court in evaluating reliability of eyewitness identification; whether trial counsel's performance had to be evaluated on basis of law at time of petitioner's criminal trial.</i></p>	541

Bolat v. Bolat . . . . .	468
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for modification of child support; whether trial court improperly failed to consider increase in defendant's income from date of initial order to date of modification hearing prior to determining that there was no substantial change in circumstances; whether trial court abused its discretion in finding plaintiff in wilful contempt for failing to pay extracurricular activity expenses for minor children pursuant to separation agreement; whether order was sufficiently clear and unambiguous to support finding of contempt; whether trial court erred in finding that defendant had wilfully disobeyed order.</i>	
Bracken v. Windsor Locks . . . . .	312
<i>Contracts; alleged breach of settlement agreement; statute of limitations; laches; claim that action for breach of settlement agreement that reinstated plaintiff to full benefits, privileges and emoluments of employment as police officer accrued when defendant town first failed to make payment toward pension credit for that period upon plaintiff's reinstatement to service; claim that present action was barred by six year statute of limitations pertaining to contracts (§ 52-576); whether trial court erroneously found that plaintiff's action accrued when plaintiff was reinstated to employment where plaintiff pleaded and proved that pension credits could be purchased retroactively at any time prior to date that plaintiff began to receive pension benefits; whether trial court improperly determined that action was barred by doctrine of laches; whether trial court's finding that defendant was prejudiced by delay was clearly erroneous.</i>	
Clements v. Aramark Corp. . . . .	224
<i>Workers' compensation; whether plaintiff's head injury was compensable under Workers Compensation Act (§ 31-275 et seq.); whether plaintiff's head injury arose out of employment; claim that Workers' Compensation Review Board improperly concluded that plaintiff's head injury did not arise out of employment because fall was caused by personal infirmity rather than workplace condition.</i>	
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Pollard . . . . .	483
<i>Foreclosure; counterclaim; summary judgment; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment in favor of plaintiff on counterclaim; claim that trial court construed transaction test too narrowly; whether trial court abuse its discretion in determining that counterclaim did not have sufficient nexus to making, validity or enforcement of note or mortgage to survive summary judgment.</i>	
Finney v. Zahedi (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	903
Francis v. Commissioner of Correction. . . . .	647
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner's prior habeas counsel did not render ineffective assistance in failing to question witness properly and in failing to present evidence of that witness' availability to testify at petitioner's criminal trial; whether habeas court properly denied third habeas petition; whether petitioner demonstrated that he was prejudiced by allegedly deficient performance of prior habeas counsel.</i>	
Gartrell v. Hartford . . . . .	526
<i>Directed verdict; action for damages for violations of state building code; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court erred in directing verdict in favor of defendant city on basis of jury's answer to single interrogatory where plaintiffs failed to raise issue to court on record, either before or after jury was charged, or as basis for denying city's motion for directed verdict.</i>	
General Ins. Co. of America v. Okeke . . . . .	83
<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>	
Geoffrey M. v. Asia M. (See Asia M. v. Geoffrey M.) . . . . .	22
Georges v. OB-GYN Services, PC (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	901
Hamburg v. Hamburg . . . . .	332
<i>Dissolution of marriage; domesticated foreign dissolution judgment; whether trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss; whether trial court erroneously concluded that substitute plaintiff, as temporary administrator of estate of decedent, had standing to prosecute action for repayment of funds that defendant took from children's education accounts; whether trial court improperly concluded that because defendant had prior opportunity to raise claim of standing at time</i>	

	<i>substitute plaintiff filed motion to be substituted as plaintiff, defendant was precluded from questioning standing of substitute plaintiff to pursue moneys owed children; whether substitute plaintiff had direct interest in moneys defendant took from children's education funds; whether trial court properly granted motion to intervene filed by one of children.</i>	
Jayne K. v. Kyle S. (See Kyle S. v. Jayne K.) . . . . .		353
Kaplan v. Scheer . . . . .		488
	<i>Reformation of deed; mutual mistake; claim that trial court misinterpreted parties' settlement agreement by concluding that alphanumeric prefixes were included only for convenience and did not bear on parties' intent; claim that trial court erred in rejecting claim of mutual mistake; whether trial court's finding that plaintiff failed to prove mutual mistake by clear and convincing evidence was clearly erroneous; credibility determinations.</i>	
Kuehl v. Koskoff . . . . .		505
	<i>Legal malpractice; claim that defendants committed legal malpractice by failing to tell plaintiff that she was required to file notice of claim for workers' compensation survivor's benefits within one year statute of limitations; whether trial court improperly denied motion to set aside verdict; failure of plaintiff to provide expert testimony on causation; whether trial court properly concluded that jury could discern whether automobile collision occurred during course of employment of plaintiff's husband and that death was result of collision; whether statutory and regulatory rules related to workers' compensation claims were within ken of jury; whether expert testimony was required to enable jury to determine causal relationship between any legal malpractice and plaintiff's alleged damages.</i>	
Kyle S. v. Jayne K. . . . .		353
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; custody orders; relief from abuse; emergency ex parte order of custody; whether trial court erred in granting application for relief from abuse; whether trial court erred in granting application for emergency ex parte order of custody; whether trial court erred in admitting minor child's mental health records into evidence; claim that waivers by parents were invalid; whether trial court improperly delegated its authority to nonjudicial entity.</i>	
Labissoniere v. Gaylord Hospital, Inc. . . . .		445
	<i>Medical malpractice; motion to dismiss; personal jurisdiction; sufficiency of opinion letter authored by similar health care provider; claim that trial court improperly considered defendants' supporting affidavits and thereby applied incorrect legal standard in deciding motions to dismiss; whether opinion letter authored by physician and general surgeon was by "similar health care provider" as defined by statute (§ 52-184c) when defendant physicians were board certified in internal medicine; claim that trial court improperly required that opinion letter state that defendant physicians were acting outside scope of their medical specialty in order to apply exception in § 52-184c (c) for physicians who provide treatment and diagnosis outside area of specialty; claim that treatment and diagnosis of plaintiffs' decedent was within medical specialty of surgery and that exception to requirement that author of opinion letter be similar health care provider applied.</i>	
Lewis v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		901
Lynn v. Bosco . . . . .		200
	<i>Declaratory judgment; action seeking declaratory judgment to determine whether plaintiffs' preemptive rights as shareholders of stock in defendant corporation were violated in connection with sale of certain shares of corporation's stock to individual defendants; whether trial court had authority to order equitable relief that imposed remedy on defendant corporation, which was cited in as defendant for notice purposes only; whether trial court's order was inconsistent with issues as framed in pleadings, which did not include any allegations of wrongdoing against defendant corporation or seek any relief from it; whether defendant corporation had notice that equitable relief would enter against it; whether trial court's order resulted in unfair surprise to defendant corporation.</i>	
Mann v. Bains (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		902
Marc Group, LLC v. Yale Builders, LLC (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		902
Murillo v. United Builders Supply Co. . . . .		594
	<i>Contracts; whether trial court's finding that 2009 e-mail was offer that plaintiff never accepted was clearly erroneous; challenge to trial court's finding that parties had not formed contract; whether new trial on breach of contract claim was necessary; reviewability of claim challenging trial court's finding that decking materials purchased from defendant were not defective.</i>	

Peacock v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	901
Perez v. University of Connecticut . . . . .	278
<i>Negligence; sovereign immunity; claim that trial court improperly granted state's motion to strike matter from jury list in violation of plaintiff's constitutional right to jury trial; whether plaintiff established that he would have been able to bring present action seeking money damages against state prior to 1818; claim that jury trial was permissible in actions against state authorized by General Assembly pursuant to statute (§ 4-159) because state must be treated as private person pursuant to §§ 4-159 (c); whether § 4-159 (c) could be fairly construed to grant to plaintiff rights he would have had if action were brought against private person rather than state, including right to jury trial; whether statute (§ 4-160 [c]) could be read as conferring right to jury trial when § 4-160 (f) expressly provides that actions brought against state pursuant to § 4-159 shall be tried to court, not jury.</i>	
Plainville v. Almost Home Animal Rescue & Shelter, Inc. . . . .	55
<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>	
Reyher v. Finkeldey . . . . .	159
<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>	
Ross v. Winthrop (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	902
State v. Bennett . . . . .	71
<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>	
State v. Bischoff . . . . .	563
<i>Possession of narcotics; possession of less than four ounces of cannabis-type substance; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of possession of narcotics; claim that state failed to prove that defendant had actual or constructive possession of narcotics; whether trial court properly denied request to instruct jury on third-party culpability; claim that 2015 amendment of statute applicable to possession of narcotics (§ 21a-279 [a]) subsequent to defendant's conviction applied retroactively and entitled defendant to resentencing on conviction of possession of narcotics.</i>	
State v. Brown . . . . .	112
<i>Murder; criminal possession of firearm; claim that trial court committed plain error by providing inadequate jury instructions regarding eyewitness testimony and 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.</i>	
State v. Corver . . . . .	622
<i>Attempt to commit murder; assault in first degree; kidnapping in first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying request to discharge counsel on day before jury selection was to begin; unreserved claim that waiver of right to jury trial was not made knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily due to</i>	

	<i>breakdown in communication with counsel and refusal by trial court to grant defendant continuance to consider whether to elect court trial.</i>	
State v. Crosby . . . . .		373
	<i>Robbery in first degree; larceny in third degree; whether trial court improperly denied motions to dismiss charges in violation of defendant's due process rights and rights under Interstate Agreement on Detainers (§ 54-186 et seq.), where state delayed more than four years after arrest warrant had been issued before extraditing defendant from Massachusetts; claim that trial court improperly determined date that state lodged detainee; claim that delay in lodging detainee had impact on memory of eyewitnesses, thereby resulting in substantial prejudice to defendant; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress witness identifications made from photographic array; claim that identification procedure was unnecessarily suggestive; whether photographs in array were too dissimilar from photograph of defendant in array; claim that absence of use of sequential, double-blind photographic array rendered identification procedure unnecessarily suggestive; claim that defendant was denied fair trial because trial court's jury instruction on identification allegedly failed to explain certain factors that negatively impact on identifications made by witnesses; claim that defendant was denied fair trial because trial court allegedly excluded instructions necessary to assist jury in assessing accuracy of eyewitness perception and credibility.</i>	
State v. Dijmarescu . . . . .		135
	<i>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.</i>	
State v. Hall . . . . .		103
	<i>Manlaughter 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.</i>	
State v. Hearl . . . . .		237
	<i>Cruelty to animals; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of cruelty to animals; claim that trial court improperly declined to instruct jury on criminal negligence, where general intent is appropriate mens rea for "unjustifiably injures" clause of animal cruelty statute (§ 53-247 [a]); unpreserved claim that § 53-247 (a) is unconstitutionally vague as applied to defendant's conduct because terms "charge" and "custody" in § 53-247 (a) did not provide notice that defendant bore responsibility of caring for goats; unpreserved claim that conviction of nineteen charges of animal cruelty violated prohibition against double jeopardy; claim that phrase "any animal" in § 53-247 (a) refers to species of animal rather than to individual animal.</i>	
State v. Holmes . . . . .		124
	<i>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.</i>	
State v. Ortiz . . . . .		580
	<i>Possession of sawed-off shotgun; possession of weapon in motor vehicle; whether trial court properly denied motion to suppress; whether warrantless seizure of shotgun from defendant's van following his confinement in police cruiser was permissible under plain view exception to warrant requirement; claim that intru-</i>	

	<i>sion that enabled police to view shotgun was unlawful once defendant was placed in handcuffs in police cruiser; whether incriminating character of object viewed was immediately apparent.</i>	
State v. Ramos . . . . .		604
	<i>Manslaughter in first degree with firearm; whether defendant was deprived of his constitutional rights to present defense and to cross-examine witnesses when trial court prevented him from questioning police officers about alleged inadequacies in their investigation of victim's death; whether defendant's multiple offers of proof failed to indicate how further, specific investigation into possible connection between prior burglary and victim's death reasonably could have led to additional evidence bearing on defendant's guilt or innocence; reviewability of claim that trial court abused its discretion in admitting into evidence testimony regarding victim's relationship with defendant prior to her death.</i>	
Szymonik v. Szymonik (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		902
Tedesco v. Agolli . . . . .		291
	<i>Foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly found that defendant member of defendant limited liability company had authority to bind defendant limited liability company to mortgage at issue; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts, issues and applicable law.</i>	
Ugalde v. Saint Mary's Hospital, Inc. . . . .		1
	<i>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.</i>	
White v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .		188
	<i>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.</i>	
Zilkha v. Zilka . . . . .		459
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court properly denied motion to return certain escrow funds; claim that trial court disregarded order of this court by failing to effectuate return of escrow funds; whether trial court erred by not using its equitable powers to effectuate return of subject funds.</i>	