

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 184

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Gause	643
<i>Arbitration; application to vacate arbitration award pursuant to statute (§ 52-418 [a] [4]); motion to confirm award; claim that appeal was moot because plaintiff failed to oppose motion to confirm award; whether plaintiff could have obtained practical relief through reversal of trial court's decision denying application to vacate award; claim that arbitrator's award of punitive damages constituted manifest disregard of law pursuant to § 52-418 (a) (4); whether arbitrator acted within his discretion in crediting defendant's evidence of certain violations against plaintiff's lack of evidence in rebuttal; whether arbitrator's conclusions indicated extraordinary lack of fidelity to established legal principles.</i>	
Ajluni v. Chainani	650
<i>Contracts; guarantee; statute of limitations (§ 52-276); whether trial court's finding that defendant reaffirmed existence of subject debt, thereby tolling statute of limitations, was clearly erroneous; whether there was adequate evidence in record to support trial court's finding of reaffirmation; whether statements defendant made in e-mails to plaintiff unequivocally acknowledged that he owed debt to plaintiff; whether defendant expressed intention not to pay debt.</i>	
Banks v. Commissioner of Correction	101
<i>Habeas corpus; kidnapping in first degree; robbery in first degree; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; claim that habeas court improperly determined that lack of jury instruction pursuant to State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509) concerning intent and conduct necessary to find petitioner guilty of kidnapping was harmless beyond reasonable doubt; whether significance of Salamon factors for making determination of whether petitioner's movement or confinement of individuals was necessary or incidental to commission of robberies that were in favor of petitioner outweighed significance of factors that supported claim of harmless error; whether respondent Commissioner of Correction met considerable burden to persuade court beyond reasonable doubt that absence of Salamon jury instruction did not contribute to jury verdict regarding kidnapping counts; whether question of petitioner's intent in movement and confinement of individuals was uncontested or supported by overwhelming evidence.</i>	
Bell v. Commissioner of Correction.	150
<i>Habeas corpus; kidnapping in first degree; robbery in first degree; claim that petitioner was entitled to jury instruction on kidnapping charges pursuant to State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509); whether lack of Salamon instruction was harmless error; whether properly instructed jury would not have concluded necessarily that robberies were completed prior to movement and confinement of victims; whether properly instructed jury could have determined that movement and confinement occurred during continuous sequence of events that was related to taking of money from safes and was not separate criminal offense; whether question of petitioner's intent in moving and confining victims during robberies was contested; whether movement and confinement of victims constituted continuous, uninterrupted course of conduct that was related to robberies or independent criminal acts that established petitioner's intent to prevent victims' liberation for longer period of time and to greater degree than was necessary for commission of robberies.</i>	
Bisson v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.	619
<i>Negligence; premises liability; business invitee; constructive notice; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant met its initial burden of establishing absence of genuine issue of material fact with respect to constructive notice element of premises liability action for business invitee; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff failed to present evidence demonstrating existence of disputed factual issue as to constructive notice element; reviewability of inadequately briefed claim that presence of snow on ground on day of plaintiff's fall increased defendant's duty to keep its premises in reasonably safe condition.</i>	

- Blossom's Escort, LLC v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act 448
Unemployment compensation benefits; whether trial court improperly dismissed appeal from decision of Employment Security Board of Review affirming decision of appeals referee that affirmed decision of defendant Administrator of Unemployment Compensation Act that plaintiff was liable for certain unpaid unemployment compensation contributions under Unemployment Compensation Act (§ 31-222 et seq.); whether trial court properly determined that amendment (Public Acts 2008, No. 08-150) to statute ([Rev. to 2007] § 31-222 (a) (5) (O)) that sets forth types of services that are exempt from definition of employment under § 31-222 did not apply to present case where audit period preceded effective date of amendment to statute; claim that because administrator informed plaintiff of liability for unemployment compensation benefits following effective date of amendment in P.A. 08-150, date of determination letter triggered application of amendment; whether audit period referenced in determination letter was time period during which plaintiff's obligation to make unemployment compensation contributions arose.
- Carson v. Allianz Life Ins. Co. of North America 318
Conversion; accidental failure of suit statute (§ 52-592); motion for summary judgment; statute of limitations; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether plaintiff's action was barred by applicable statute of limitations; claim that fraudulent concealment on part of defendant's agent tolled statute of limitations; whether there was any evidence of defendant's alleged concealment or knowledge of any purported fraud by agent; whether agent's knowledge could be imputed to defendant for purposes of tolling statute of limitations; claim that continuing course of conduct doctrine tolled statute of limitations; whether defendant had fiduciary duty to plaintiff such that continuing course of conduct doctrine would apply.
- Chance v. Commissioner of Correction. 524
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether habeas court improperly determined that trial counsel did not render ineffective assistance by failing to present to trial court jury instructions that were consistent with State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509); whether habeas court improperly determined that trial counsel did not render ineffective assistance by failing to file motion to suppress incriminating statements made by petitioner to police.
- Chaplen v. Doyle (See Doyle v. Chaplen) 278
- Christiana Trust v. Lewis 659
Foreclosure; summary judgment; foreclosure mediation program; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to liability; whether genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether signature on subject mortgage was that of defendant; whether statements in defendant's affidavit in support of his opposition to motion for summary judgment that he had reviewed subject mortgage and that he had not signed mortgage contradicted evidence submitted by named plaintiff in support of its motion for summary judgment as to liability and gave rise to genuine issue of material fact as to authenticity of signature on mortgage; whether trial court improperly deemed defendant's statements in 2011 bankruptcy proceeding to be judicial admissions binding on court; whether trial court improperly considered defendant's participation in foreclosure mediation program as admissible evidence relating to issue of validity of mortgage.
- Crismale v. Walston 2
Defamation; slander; malicious prosecution; claim that there were genuine issues of material fact as to whether qualified privilege, which protected named defendant's statements to enforcement officers that plaintiff was trespassing on clam beds and stealing clams, could be defeated because statements were made with malice; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment on slander claim, on basis of named defendant's statement to newspaper reporter, after concluding that statement was opinion on matter of public concern that was protected by fair comment privilege; whether statement to reporter was statement of fact rather than statement of opinion; whether uncontested facts established truth of statement that was absolute bar to slander claim; whether there was genuine issue of material fact as to whether named defendant provided misleading information to Department of Energy and Environmental Protection that induced enforcement officers to arrest plaintiff.

Diaz v. Dept. of Social Services	538
<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed denial and dismissal by Workers' Compensation Commissioner of plaintiff's claim for medical and indemnity benefits; whether commissioner's determination that plaintiff's claimed injuries were not a substantial factor in medical conditions and need for surgery was supported by evidence and was not inconsistent with law; whether board properly affirmed commissioner's denial of motion to correct findings, where findings were supported by evidence and included all material facts as determined by commissioner; whether board abused its discretion in denying motion to submit additional evidence to board; whether board reasonably could have concluded that plaintiff did not demonstrate that plaintiff had good reason for not presenting additional evidence to commissioner, where documents were in existence approximately four years before formal hearing on workers' compensation claim commenced.</i>	
Downing v. Dragone	565
<i>Contracts; challenge to trial court's finding that defendant company breached implied in fact contract; whether trial court's finding that named defendant testified that he had written contract on his desk but did not read it until four months after auction was clearly erroneous; whether trial court substantially relied on clearly erroneous factual finding in rendering judgment in part for plaintiff; whether new trial on breach of contract claim was necessary.</i>	
Doyle v. Chaplen	278
<i>Paternity; child custody and support; claim that trial court improperly found that mother signed acknowledgment of paternity on basis of material mistake of fact; claim that trial court improperly concluded that opening judgment was in best interests of minor child after making clearly erroneous finding that there was no parent-like relationship between acknowledged father and minor child; claim that trial court misapplied law regarding laches and equitable estoppel; whether trial court's finding that acknowledgment of paternity was signed on basis of material mistake of fact was clearly erroneous; whether trial court's finding that acknowledged father did not have parent-like relationship with minor child was clearly erroneous; whether trial court properly determined that mother was not equitably estopped from opening judgment in support action; whether trial court properly determined that elements of equitable estoppel had not been established.</i>	
Drabik v. Thomas	238
<i>Petition for bill of discovery seeking to depose defendant employees of certain Indian tribe and officers of tribe's historic preservation office; whether trial court improperly granted defendants' motion to dismiss on ground of tribal sovereign immunity; whether trial court correctly determined that certain defendants were entitled to tribal sovereign immunity; whether certain defendants were named in individual capacities or acted beyond scope of authority as employees of tribe and officers of tribe's historic preservation office.</i>	
Farmer-Lanctot v. Shand	249
<i>Negligence; whether trial court improperly denied request for jury charge on sudden emergency doctrine, standard of care for pedestrian in roadway, and defendant's duty to yield to pedestrians when making right-hand turn; whether trial court properly declined to instruct jury in accordance with model instructions regarding crossing at crosswalk; whether, under general verdict rule, this court, which resolved plaintiff's sole challenge to court's jury instructions as to negligence and concluded that there was no error, was required to presume that jury found that defendant was not negligent; whether general verdict rule precluded review of plaintiff's remaining claims relating to instructions on contributory negligence.</i>	
Farrell v. Johnson & Johnson	685
<i>Intentional misrepresentation; claim that trial court abused its discretion in permitting reference to former defendants; claim that trial court abused its discretion in excluding journal articles from evidence as inadmissible hearsay; whether trial court properly directed verdict for defendants on claim for innocent misrepresentation; whether innocent misrepresentation claims primarily apply to business transactions; claim that trial court abused its discretion in declining to instruct jury as requested by plaintiffs.</i>	
57 Broad Street Stamford, LLC v. Summer House Owners, LLC	834
<i>Injunction; action seeking injunction restraining defendant from interfering with plaintiffs' alleged rights under certain easement; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant's construction of service access structure did not materially interfere with plaintiffs' reasonable use and enjoyment of easement; whether</i>	

	<i>language of easement provided for full and unlimited access by large vehicles or prohibited construction of permanent structures within easement area; claim that trial court modified plaintiffs' easement rights in concluding that defendant had unilateral right to determine method, timing and location by which plaintiffs might use easement area; whether trial court properly construed language of easement; whether plaintiffs' assertion that entirety of easement area must be available to them comported with stricture of Stefanoni v. Duncan (282 Conn. 686), that use of easement be reasonable and as little burdensome to servient estate as possible; whether plaintiffs' interpretation that easement provided them with unlimited access was unreasonable under clear language of easement.</i>	
Glastonbury v. Sakon		385
	<i>Foreclosure; action to foreclose municipal tax liens; attorney's fees authorized by statute (§ 12-193); claim that total award of attorney's fees was unreasonable when compared to amount of tax liens at issue and to attorney's fees awarded in similar tax lien foreclosure cases; whether trial court abused discretion in determining amount of attorney's fees awarded.</i>	
Goodwin Estate Assn., Inc. v. Starke		92
	<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court improperly denied motions to dismiss and to open judgment; reviewability of claim that trial court, in denying motion to dismiss, improperly considered equities and length of time that plaintiff had been deprived of fees; claim that trial court committed plain error in denying motion to dismiss because defendant had not received notice from plaintiff of adopted standard foreclosure policy.</i>	
Government Employees Ins. Co. v. Barros		395
	<i>Equitable subrogation; uninsured motorist benefits; claim that equitable subrogation action was subject to same statute of limitations period as underlying tort claims; whether claim sounding in equity is subject to statute of limitations; reviewability of claim that equitable subrogation action was precluded under doctrine of laches.</i>	
Green v. Commissioner of Correction		76
	<i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed habeas petition pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-24) without holding hearing; whether habeas court properly dismissed habeas petition sua sponte for lack of jurisdiction; claim that petitioner was being deprived of risk reduction credits; whether petitioner had constitutionally protected liberty interest in risk reduction credits; whether applicable statute (§ 18-98e) conferred broad discretion on respondent Commissioner of Correction to award such credits; claim that commissioner altered discretionary nature of risk credit program by entering into binding contract with petitioner.</i>	
Hirsch v. Woerner		583
	<i>Foreclosure; foreclosure by sale; special defense of unconscionability; motion to strike special defenses; motion to open judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted motion to strike special defense of unconscionability; whether defendant sufficiently pleaded facts to support special defense of unconscionability on procedural grounds; whether defendant's assertion that loan was predatory because of term of one year, with interest rate of 15 percent, and points of 5 percent, alone, was sufficient to render contract unenforceable on ground of substantive unconscionability; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to open judgment; whether defendant timely raised special defense of statutory violation; whether special defense was available to defendant prior to when judgment was rendered; whether defendant offered any evidence that there was good and compelling reason for modification to special defenses after judgment was rendered.</i>	
Holliday v. Commissioner of Correction		228
	<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court improperly dismissed petition for writ of habeas corpus; whether habeas court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over claim that 2013 revision to parole eligibility statute (§ 54-125a [b]) violated petitioner's rights to due process and equal protection, and constitutional prohibition against ex post facto laws; whether petitioner demonstrated liberty interest that was implicated by loss of risk reduction credits toward parole eligibility; whether habeas court improperly dismissed habeas petition without notice or hearing pursuant to rule of practice (§ 23-29 [1]) that authorized court to dismiss habeas petition on own motion.</i>	
In re Joheli V.		259
	<i>Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court erred in determining that respondent father had failed to achieve such degree of personal rehabilitation as</i>	

would encourage belief that within reasonable time respondent could assume responsible position in minor child's life based solely upon respondent's current incarceration for allegedly sexually assaulting minor child; whether trial court based determination that respondent failed to rehabilitate solely on ground that respondent was incarcerated; whether trial court's determination that respondent's efforts to rehabilitate were scant even before arrest was supported by record.

Jordan v. Biller 848
Trespass; license and view easement; claim that trial court improperly determined that view easement was not appurtenant to defendants' land; claim that trial court erred in awarding plaintiffs damages; whether trial court properly determined that view easement granted to previous owners of defendants' property was personal and did not run with land; whether view easement was proven to enhance value of defendants' property; whether there was lack of historical usage of easement; whether intent of parties expressed in language of bond for deed and license and view easement evidenced personal right instead of appurtenant easement that was intended to run with land; whether defendants overcame presumption that view easement, which did not expressly mention heirs and assigns of grantee, was not appurtenant.

Kaye v. Housman 808
Contracts; landlord-tenant; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to strike case from hearing in damages where defendant filed answer and special defenses, which plaintiff did not ask to be revised; claim that special defenses were part of answer and that defendant was in default on entire complaint for failing to revise eight of twelve special defenses; whether answer and special defenses have legally distinct functions; whether relevant rules of practice provide that special defenses are part of answer for purposes of default.

Keusch v. Keusch 822
Dissolution of marriage; alimony and child support; whether trial court erroneously computed defendant's presumptive minimum child support obligation on basis of defendant's earning capacity; whether proper remedy was to remand matter for reconsideration of all of trial court's financial orders; whether trial court abused its discretion by ordering defendant to pay nonmodifiable unallocated alimony and child support.

Landmark Development Group, LLC v. Water & Sewer Commission 303
Administrative appeal; appeal from decision by water and sewer commission granting in part application for sewer treatment capacity determination; claim that defendant commission improperly allocated 14,434 gallons per day of sewer treatment capacity to plaintiffs' proposed development when plaintiffs' application for determination of sewer capacity requested 118,000 gallons per day; whether trial court abused discretion by granting motion to supplement record and to conduct discovery regarding sewage capacity effectively allocated to another similarly-situated development; claim that trial court abused discretion by admitting supplemental evidence; whether evidence concerning other development was relevant; whether plaintiffs had prior opportunity to present evidence concerning other development to commission; whether law of case doctrine required trial court to apply certain factors with regard to sewage capacity because trial court in prior remand order required commission to apply those factors; whether evidence regarding other development constituted new or overriding circumstances for purposes of law of case doctrine; whether trial court acted unreasonably, illegally, or in abuse of discretion when it sustained plaintiffs' appeal and remanded matter to commission.

Marshall v. Commissioner of Correction 709
Habeas corpus; burglary in second degree; burglary in first degree; assault in first degree; violation of probation; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner's trial counsel did not provide ineffective assistance due to conflict of interest as result of counsel's prior representation of witness in unrelated criminal case; whether trial counsel actively represented conflicting interest that adversely affected trial counsel's performance; whether petitioner produced evidence that trial counsel received confidential information during representation of witness that would have affected petitioner's defense or limited trial counsel's ability to effectively cross-examine witness; whether there was sound tactical reason for trial counsel not to cross-examine witness with pending charges; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner's trial counsel did not provide ineffective assistance by failing to move to suppress witness' identification of petitioner from photographic array; whether trial counsel had reasonable

	<i>basis to conclude that motion to suppress one or more photographic identifications of petitioner would not have been granted; whether petitioner demonstrated that trial counsel's performance was deficient or how petitioner was prejudiced thereby; whether habeas court properly determined that trial counsel did not provide ineffective assistance in failing to challenge consolidation of petitioner's two criminal cases for trial; whether trial counsel's decision to not oppose state's motion to consolidate was reasonable and founded on reasonable strategic grounds; reviewability of claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance in failing to object to trial court's exclusion of petitioner from participation in in-chambers conference.</i>	
Merk-Gould v. Gould		512
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court's finding that defendant had annual earning capacity of \$200,000 was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court abused its discretion in valuing defendant's interests in certain private equity companies on basis of cost of assets at time of purchase rather than as of date of marital dissolution; whether evidence supported finding that \$200,000 was net amount that defendant could realistically be expected to earn after being left with only 40 percent of investment assets after trial court awarded 60 percent to plaintiff; claim that trial court's order was precise means of providing remedy for defendant's dissipation of marital assets; failure to raise claim before trial court; whether trial court's alimony award was necessarily interwoven with court's remaining financial and property orders.</i>	
Palosz v. Greenwich		201
	<i>Wrongful death; motion to strike; claim that board of education was entitled to sovereign immunity from wrongful death action arising out of suicide of student following severe and continual bullying while student was enrolled in school system; whether board was acting as agent of state when employees allegedly failed to comply with terms of policy that board had adopted to address bullying in school system in accordance with statute (§ [Rev. to 2011] 10-222d [as amended by Public Acts 2011, No. 11-232, § 1]); whether board was entitled to sovereign immunity in light of qualified immunity specifically provided to local board of education pursuant to statute (§ 10-222a) for actions taken by the board with respect to policies adopted pursuant to § 10-222d.</i>	
Real Estate Mortgage Network, Inc. v. Squillante		356
	<i>Foreclosure; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly denied named defendant's second motion to reopen judgment of strict foreclosure; whether trial court correctly concluded that motion to reopen was moot; whether trial court should have dismissed rather than have denied motion to reopen.</i>	
Rocco v. Shaikh		786
	<i>Quiet title; discharge of invalid lien; claim that plaintiffs lacked standing to maintain statutory causes of action to quiet title (§ 47-31) and to discharge allegedly invalid lien (§§ 49-13 and 49-92e) against real property; whether claim that plaintiffs lacked standing to maintain statutory causes of action was moot; whether there was practical relief that could be afforded to defendants where title to subject property has vested in third party and defendants conceded that they had no legal or equitable right or interest in property; claim that trial court's judgment was procured by fraud; request for this court to exercise supervisory authority over administration of justice to reverse trial court's judgment.</i>	
Sovereign Bank v. Harrison		436
	<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court erred in interpreting defendant's special defense as counterclaim; whether trial court lacked authority to grant motion to restore case to docket; whether third special defense could reasonably be construed as stating independent cause of action.</i>	
State v. Carney		456
	<i>Murder; motion to correct illegal sentence; whether trial court properly construed applicable statutes (§§ 17a-566 and 17a-567) and declined to hold that receipt of information from personnel at Whiting Forensic Division regarding recommendations for defendant's psychiatric treatment required sentencing court to consider more lenient sentence than that agreed on in plea agreement; claim that sentencing court relied on inaccurate information in sentencing defendant.</i>	
State v. Covington		332
	<i>Carrying pistol without permit; criminal possession of firearm; whether evidence was insufficient to support conviction of carrying pistol without permit; whether jury's inability to reach unanimous verdict on charges of murder and assault in first degree suggested that jury did not believe that defendant was shooter;</i>	

whether jury could have found that defendant possessed pistol, as defined by statute (§ 29-27), at time and place of shooting; unpreserved claim that conviction of criminal possession of firearm should be vacated; claim that defendant's rights to trial by jury and to fair trial were violated because trial court's finding of guilt as to charge of criminal possession of firearm contravened jury's inability to reach unanimous verdict on murder and assault charges; unpreserved claim that defendant was entitled to new sentencing hearing because trial court impermissibly relied on facts that contravened jury's determination as to murder and assault charges.

State v. Durdek	492
<i>Murder; burglary in first degree; sexual assault in first degree; arson in first degree; tampering with physical evidence; claim that trial court improperly restricted defendant's cross-examination of state's witness by preventing defendant, for purposes of impeachment, from asking witness about misconduct that witness allegedly had committed as juvenile; whether defendant had provided adequate record to review claim when defendant failed to make offer of proof regarding how witness would have responded to any question about alleged misconduct.</i>	
State v. Ezequiel R.	55
<i>Aggravated sexual assault of minor; sexual assault in first degree; risk of injury to child; sexual assault in fourth degree; whether trial court properly determined that victim's statements made during forensic interview fell within medical diagnosis or treatment exception to hearsay rule; whether trial court abused discretion in admitting video recording of victim's forensic interview into evidence; whether statements during forensic interview of child that are offered solely under medical diagnosis and treatment exception are admissible if such statements are reasonably pertinent to obtaining medical diagnosis or treatment, even if primary purpose of declarant's statements was not to obtain medical diagnosis and treatment; whether there was sufficient evidence in record to demonstrate that victim's statements were reasonably pertinent to obtaining medical diagnosis and treatment; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court improperly allowed clinical child interview specialist to render expert opinion that appeared to be based on facts of case.</i>	
State v. Griffin	595
<i>Arson in first degree; conspiracy to commit arson in first degree; insurance fraud; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to suppress witnesses' identifications of defendant that were made to police from photographic arrays and in court; whether photographic arrays were unduly suggestive; claim that there was increased risk that witnesses would select defendant's photograph from arrays because photographs were administered simultaneously instead of sequentially; whether evidence was insufficient to support conviction of arson in first degree and conspiracy to commit arson in first degree; claim that there was no evidence that defendant started fire with intent to collect insurance proceeds related to mother's homeowner's policy; claim that evidence was insufficient to establish that defendant possessed requisite mens rea to support conspiracy conviction; whether conviction of insurance fraud as to fraudulent insurance claim by defendant's mother could not stand where there was no evidence that defendant participated in making or preparation of any statement that was provided to mother's home insurer.</i>	
State v. Harper	24
<i>Conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; attempt to commit robbery in first degree as accessory; whether evidence adduced at trial was sufficient to sustain conviction; claim that conviction of attempt to commit robbery in first degree as accessory required proof that defendant knew or believed that one of cohorts would be armed with deadly weapon during attempted robbery; whether statute (§ 53a-134 [a] [2]) governing robbery in first degree requires proof that defendant intended to possess or intended for accomplice to possess deadly weapon; whether trial court improperly declined to provide jury with unanimity instruction as requested by defendant; claim that jurors must be instructed that unanimity is required on nature or source of reasonable doubt.</i>	
State v. Jackson	419
<i>Sexual assault in first degree; unlawful restraint; collateral estoppel; double jeopardy; claim that trial court improperly admitted into evidence in defendant's second trial portion of witness' statement that jury in defendant's first trial necessarily had rejected when jury found defendant not guilty of unlawful restraint charge; whether admission of evidence violated defendant's fifth amendment guarantee</i>	

	<i>against double jeopardy; whether finding of not guilty on charge of unlawful restraint and finding that witness made credible statement were not mutually exclusive findings or in any way inconsistent; whether jury reasonably could have believed statement but found that statement did not establish or demonstrate that defendant had intent to unlawfully restrain victim; whether defendant demonstrated that jury, in finding defendant not guilty of unlawful restraint in first trial, necessarily rejected witness' statement.</i>	
State v. Lugojanu		576
	<i>Conspiracy to commit home invasion; whether trial court improperly dismissed defendant's motion to correct illegal sentence for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether court had jurisdiction to consider defendant's claim that sentence of twenty years of incarceration followed by five year term of probation exceeded statutory twenty year limit for class B felony; claim that sentence was illegal because there was disparity between defendant's sentence and sentences received by other participants in underlying crime; claim that prosecutor improperly increased defendant's recommended sentence under plea deal after defendant elected jury trial.</i>	
State v. McKethan		187
	<i>Murder; carrying pistol without permit; possession of narcotics; motion for joinder; whether trial court abused discretion in consolidating two informations for trial; whether defendant demonstrated that joinder resulted in substantial prejudice; whether trial court's explicit instructions to jury to consider each charge separately in reaching verdict cured risk of substantial prejudice to defendant.</i>	
State v. Si		402
	<i>Negligent homicide with commercial motor vehicle; claim that trial court improperly instructed jury because it failed to instruct jurors that it would be complete defense to charge of negligent homicide with commercial motor vehicle that decedent's negligence was sole proximate cause of own death; claim that jury charge was materially misleading because jury instructions on proximate causation could have led jury to disregard conduct of decedent entirely and, thus, to ignore possibility that decedent was sole proximate cause of own death; whether trial court erred when it provided jury with copy of jury charge during deliberations.</i>	
State v. Tyus		669
	<i>Murder; whether trial court committed error in granting state's motion to join defendant's case and that of another defendant for trial, where both cases arose from same incident, virtually all of state's testimonial, documentary, physical and scientific evidence would have been admissible against each defendant if they were tried separately, each defendant's defenses were not antagonistic and each defendant was other's principal alibi witness; claim that certain statement was inadmissible under coconspirator exception to hearsay rule in applicable provision (§ 8-3 [1]) of Connecticut Code of Evidence (2008), where conspiracy to commit murder count had been dismissed prior to trial; claim that trial court violated defendant's right to confrontation when it permitted state's firearms examiner to testify about firearms evidence that had been examined by examiner who had died and was unavailable for cross-examination; whether trial court improperly denied request for limiting instruction regarding testimony of firearms examiner; whether trial court's jury instructions were correct in law, adapted to issues and sufficient to guide jury.</i>	
State v. Walcott		863
	<i>Violation of probation; unpreserved claim that there was insufficient evidence to support trial court's finding that defendant constructively possessed narcotics and revolver and, therefore, that court abused its discretion by considering that unproven fact during dispositional stage of revocation proceeding.</i>	
Taylor v. Wallace		43
	<i>Legal malpractice; ripeness; subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiff's claim that defendant attorney provided deficient representation with respect to plaintiff's prior habeas corpus action was ripe for adjudication where plaintiff remained validly incarcerated and conviction has never been invalidated; whether plaintiff had standing to pursue claim that plaintiff was injured as result of defendant's purported fraud on state; claim that trial court abused discretion in denying motion to reargue.</i>	
Teodoro v. Bristol		363
	<i>Negligence; action for damages for injuries to student incurred during high school cheerleading practice; whether trial court, in deciding motion for summary judgment, improperly failed to consider excerpts from certified deposition transcripts,</i>	

where excerpts were submitted with pages from original deposition transcripts that established that original transcripts were accurate transcriptions of testimony under oath; whether excerpts from deposition transcripts were properly authenticated under rule of practice (§ 17-45) that governs admissible evidence as to issues raised in summary judgment motions; whether trial court abused discretion in not considering surreply memoranda of law in contravention of applicable rule of practice ([2016] § 11-10).

Thompson v. Commissioner of Correction 215

Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner failed to prove, by preponderance of evidence, that trial counsel rendered deficient performance by not moving for mistrial or requesting curative instruction after complainant provided prejudicial testimony; whether conclusion that trial counsel's acquiescence waived petitioner's claim that petitioner was deprived of right to fair trial as result of jury's potential exposure to prejudicial testimony equated to determination that counsel rendered ineffective assistance in handling of issue; claim that jury heard prejudicial testimony because it was reflected in trial transcript; whether petitioner failed to present evidence to rebut presumption that trial counsel's performance fell within wide range of reasonable professional assistance.

U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Eichten 727

Foreclosure; whether trial court improperly rendered judgment of strict foreclosure; whether trial court improperly rendered summary judgment as to liability on complaint; whether trial court improperly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether defendant homeowner could prevail on her special defense of unclean hands; whether trial court improperly concluded that special defense of unclean hands was invalid because it did not relate to making, validity or enforcement of mortgage note; unpreserved claim that trial court erred in concluding that special defense of equitable estoppel failed to raise genuine issue of material fact as to whether plaintiff's loan servicer induced defendant to default on mortgage loan; claim that genuine issue of material fact existed as to breach of contract special defense, which was based on assertion that plaintiff's loan servicer created offer to defendant homeowner that her mortgage loan would be permanently modified if she timely made all payments under federal mortgage modification trial period plan; whether trial court improperly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to special defense of breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing, where loan servicer failed to offer loan modification under federal mortgage modification program; whether trial court properly concluded that special defense of promissory estoppel did not raise genuine issue of material fact, where plaintiff declined to modify defendant homeowner's mortgage loan after she made trial period plan payments; whether trial court improperly rendered summary judgment as to counterclaim that alleged that plaintiff breached contract that was formed when defendant homeowner complied with conditions of trial period plan; whether counterclaim satisfied transaction test in rule of practice (§ 10-10) that required counterclaim to have sufficient relationship to making, validity or enforcement of note or mortgage; whether genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether plaintiff and defendant homeowner formed contract when defendant homeowner complied with conditions of trial period plan; whether genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether plaintiff's loan servicer was permitted to continue to review defendant homeowner's financial eligibility for federal loan modification program after end of trial period plan; claim that trial court improperly determined that contract defendant homeowner claimed was created by trial period plan did not satisfy statute of frauds (§ 52-550 [a]), where trial period plan was to be performed within one year and was not agreement for loan in excess of \$50,000.

Vaccaro v. D'Angelo 467

Interpleader; interpleader action to determine rights of defendants to portion of funds from settlement resolving personal injury action; claim that trial court improperly determined that named defendant was entitled to portion of settlement funds because named defendant failed to comply with certain provision in his provider agreement, and because authorization form provided by named defendant was unenforceable; claim that named defendant's authorization form was illegal on face and contrary to public policy because form violated statute ([Rev. to 2011] § 20-7f [b]) that makes unfair billing practice for healthcare provider to request payment, other than co-payment or deductible, from enrollee for medical services covered under managed care plan and because form violated certain

other statutory provisions ([Rev. to 2011] §§ 36a-573 and 42-150aa [b]); claim that once defendant had exhausted chiropractic benefit under health plan, § 2.03.12 (b) in provider agreement required named defendant to provide other defendant with acknowledgment form, listing all noncovered services, at each and every subsequent visit prior to treatment; reviewability of claim that authorization form violated certain statutory provisions ([Rev. to 2011] §§ 36a-573 and 42-150aa [b]); failure to brief claim adequately; claim that authorization form was illegal and against public policy because it violated § 20-7f (b).