Emeritus Senior Living v. Lepore ........................................... 23
Contracts; action to collect unpaid balance due for assisted living services; motion for summary judgment; whether trial court improperly found that residency agreement was unenforceable due to procedural or substantive flaws; whether record revealed that defendant had no meaningful choice whether to select plaintiff as provider of assisted living services; whether agreement was sufficiently clear as written to provide reasonable notice to defendant, as representative, to pay all sums due for services rendered; whether agreement plainly and unambiguously imposed personal liability on defendant in representative capacity for amounts owed to plaintiff; whether agreement was substantively unconscionable; whether agreement to ensure payment for services rendered was so unreasonable as to be unconscionable and, therefore, unenforceable; whether trial court erred by finding residency agreement unenforceable as matter of public policy.

HSBC Bank USA, N.A. v. Hallums ........................................... 175
Foreclosure; strict foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment when plaintiff bank lacked standing; claim that trial court lacked jurisdiction after defendant's debt was discharged in bankruptcy; claim that trial court improperly refused to apply best evidence rule and clean hands doctrine; whether trial court's findings were supported by record evidence; whether defendant submitted proof that someone else was owner of note and mortgage; whether in rem liability of mortgages survive discharge in bankruptcy; whether creditor's right to foreclose mortgage passes through bankruptcy proceedings; claim that debt and note became unsecured when defendant unilaterally described obligation as unsecured in bankruptcy filings despite valid mortgage lien.

Jenzack Partners, LLC v. Stoneridge Associates, LLC ............... 128
Foreclosure; standing; alleged breach of personal guarantee secured by mortgage on unrelated real property arising out of construction loan agreement; claim that plaintiff lacked standing to foreclose on mortgage on real property because individual defendant's limited guarantee was not specifically assigned from original lender to plaintiff; whether assignment of note operated as assignment of any secondary obligations attached to it; whether circumstances surrounding execution of assignment evidenced intent to assign limited guarantee; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff had established amount of debt due on note; whether testimony concerning starting balance used in computation of debt in exhibit was inadmissible hearsay where witness had no personal knowledge concerning starting balance; whether starting balance used in computation of debt was admissible under business records exception to rule against hearsay pursuant to statute (§ 52-180) when there was no evidence in record regarding lender's business records or its duty to report accurate starting balance to plaintiff; whether erroneous admission of evidence was harmful when it directly implicated amount owed under note; claim that trial court, in support of claim for attorney's fees, improperly admitted certain documents that listed nonparty as party entitled to fees.

Kargul v. Smith ................................................................. 78
Summary process; landlord and tenant; notice to quit; withdrawal of summary process complaint; claim that plaintiffs terminated lease agreement between parties by serving initial notice to quit possession in first action, and thereby deprived trial court of jurisdiction to entertain second summary process action commenced by plaintiffs; whether continuation of lease agreement between parties was restored when plaintiffs withdrew first action against defendants prior to commencement of hearing on merits.

Magsig v. Magsig ............................................................. 182
Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motion for contempt; claim that defendant willfully and intentionally breached parties' separation agreement to hold plaintiff
harmless for certain debt by intentionally defaulting on loan, which caused plaintiff to suffer losses; whether trial court properly concluded that agreement did not require plaintiff to be indemnified for any collateral damages that may be caused directly or indirectly by the nonpayment of debt; claim that trial court improperly considered evidence outside of four corners of agreement in determining parties' intent with respect to indemnification language; whether defendant's testimony regarding his understanding of what triggered obligation to indemnify plaintiff was properly admitted for purpose of determining whether defendant had wilfully violated agreement; claim that because indemnification language used in agreement indemnified against liability, plaintiff was not required to wait until she sustained actual loss to bring successful motion for contempt; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant's indemnity obligation was not triggered until bank took affirmative steps to collect from plaintiff with respect to debt.

Mikucka v. St. Lucian's Residence, Inc. 

Workers' compensation; appeal from decision of Compensation Review Board affirming decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner; claim that commissioner violated plaintiff's right to due process by not permitting plaintiff to present evidence at formal hearing in support of claim pursuant to Osterlund v. State (135 Conn. 498); whether commissioner's decision prejudicially affected plaintiff's substantive rights; whether commissioner's decision to bifurcate plaintiff's Osterlund claim protected defendants' due process rights; reviewability of claim that commissioner erred in determining that plaintiff was not totally disabled pursuant to Osterlund.

State v. Baldwin 

Risk of injury to child; violation of probation; claim that trial court's denial of motion to modify conditions of probation violated defendant's fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination in future proceedings; whether defendant waived claim by entering Alford plea and expressly agreeing, on record, to participate in sex offender treatment, including admitting to conduct that resulted in Alford plea; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to modify and not allowing defendant to delay participating in sex offender treatment until after conclusion of pending habeas matter.

State v. Dubuisson. 

Strangulation in second degree; whether evidence was sufficient for jury to have found beyond reasonable doubt that defendant committed strangulation in second degree; whether jury reasonably and logically could have concluded that defendant put his hand around victim's neck with intent to render her unable to breathe and, while acting under that intent, squeezed her neck with his fingers, thereby rendering her unable to breathe; whether trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence, under spontaneous utterance exception to hearsay rule, testimony regarding victim's statements to friend during telephone conversation; claim that because there was break in time between when defendant strangled victim and victim called friend, statements were not spontaneous.

State v. Fletcher 

Violation of probation; claim that appeal was moot because there was no practical relief that could be afforded to defendant, who had completed sentence for violating probation; whether appeal qualified for exception to mootness doctrine; whether there was reasonable possibility that, in event that defendant were to face sentencing court in future, court's determination revoking his probation and sentencing him to period of incarceration could subject him to prejudicial collateral consequences; whether there was reasonable possibility that presence of defendant's sentence for violation of probation could subject him to prejudicial collateral consequences affecting his employment opportunities and his standing in community generally; whether there was practical relief that could be afforded to defendant; unpreserved claim that trial court improperly relied on fact that was not part of record when it found that defendant had tried to elude law enforcement in their efforts to serve violation of probation warrant; whether information on which court relied satisfied requisite standard of reliability; whether defendant demonstrated that inference drawn by court was unreasonable or unjustifiable.

State v. Gerald A. 

Sexual assault in first degree; risk of injury to child; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of sexual assault in first degree; claim that state failed to prove that defendant engaged in sexual intercourse with victim within meaning of applicable statute (§ 53a-65 [2]); whether trial court abused its discretion when
it admitted certain uncharged misconduct testimony pertaining to defendant’s alleged prior physical violence toward victim and her family; whether probative value of uncharged misconduct evidence was outweighed by its prejudicial effect; whether trial court properly permitted two cases against defendant to be tried jointly; whether evidence in each case would have been cross admissible as prior misconduct in other case; claim that defendant’s conduct in each case was not similar; claim that prejudicial effect of evidence outweighed its probative value; whether trial court abused its discretion when it denied defendant’s motion to make opening statement to jury; whether trial court’s ruling was harmful.

State v. Morice W................................................................. 32
Risk of injury to child; assault in third degree; whether prosecutor’s remark during closing argument to jury about victim’s pain denied defendant fair trial; whether defendant denied fair trial as result of improper remark by prosecutor in closing argument to jury that ventriloquist during voir dire had described victim as voiceless.

State v. Morris................................................................. 181
Writ of error; unpreserved claim that trial court violated right to due process of plaintiff in error during adjudication of bond forfeiture proceedings; whether trial court properly denied motion for release from surety obligations of plaintiff in error.

State v. Smith................................................................. 54
Criminal possession of firearm; possession of weapon in motor vehicle; carrying pistol or revolver without permit; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of criminal possession of firearm, possession of weapon in motor vehicle, and carrying pistol or revolver without permit; whether jury reasonably could have found that defendant had handgun in his vehicle for which he did not have permit and was guilty as charged.