

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 185

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Thibodeau (Memorandum Decision)	907
Adkins v. Commissioner of Correction	139
<i>Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; motion to withdraw guilty plea; whether habeas court improperly rejected claim that prior habeas counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to raise claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to advise petitioner with respect to his right to appeal from denial of motion to withdraw guilty plea; whether petitioner demonstrated that nonfrivolous ground for appeal of motion to withdraw guilty plea existed; whether petitioner demonstrated that trial counsel had constitutional obligation to advise him about his right to appeal; reviewability of claim that habeas court improperly rejected claim that prior habeas counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to present evidence in support of claim that petitioner's guilty plea was result of trial counsel's ineffective assistance; whether habeas court improperly rejected claim that prior habeas counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to claim in prior habeas action that trial counsel's conflict of interest resulted in petitioner's guilty plea; whether habeas court improperly determined that petitioner had waived conflict of interest claim; whether habeas court's factual finding concerning voluntariness of petitioner's guilty plea was supported by evidence in record.</i>	
Agosto v. Premier Maintenance, Inc.	559
<i>Employment discrimination; whether trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment; whether trial court improperly applied pretext model of analysis under McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green (411 U.S. 792) and Texas Dept. of Community Affairs v. Burdine (450 U.S. 248), rather than mixed-motive model of analysis under Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins (490 U.S. 228), in determining whether plaintiff established prima facie case of employment discrimination; whether trial court properly determined that there were no genuine issues of material fact as to whether circumstances under which plaintiff was discharged from employment gave rise to prima facie inference of discrimination; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment on claim that defendant retaliated against plaintiff; whether allegations constituted protected activity.</i>	
Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC v. Beckford (Memorandum Decision)	905
Becue v. Becue	812
<i>Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment orders; cross appeal; claim that trial court improperly determined amount of defendant's child support, arrearage, and expense obligations; claim that trial court erred when it denied motion for contempt that alleged that defendant improperly engaged in self-help by repeatedly modifying or withholding child support payments; whether trial court abused its discretion when it declined to find defendant in contempt for engaging in self-help; whether evidence demonstrated that defendant stopped paying child support; whether defendant made modifications to court-ordered child support without court's permission; whether trial court's net income findings had evidentiary basis in record; whether record established that court considered defendant's request for deviation; whether trial court's response to motion for reargument on request for deviation was appropriate; whether trial court abused its discretion when it determined that it was equitable and appropriate not to deviate from child support guidelines; claim that trial court abused its discretion in ordering defendant to pay \$50,000 in attorney's fees to plaintiff; whether trial court's finding that defendant breached agreement regarding child support when defendant reduced child support payments unilaterally without court intervention was amply supported by evidence; whether trial court abused its discretion when it declined to hold plaintiff in contempt for allegedly violating parties' dissolution agreement; whether trial court abused its discretion when it held defendant in contempt for failing to make certain child support payments; whether record was</i>	

- clear that orders that defendant violated were clear and unambiguous and amply supported finding that defendant's failure to abide by court's order was wilful.*
- Bloomfield Health Care Center of Connecticut, LLC v. Doyon 340
Negligence; summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that defendant did not owe duty to plaintiff to use reasonable care in performing his duties as conservator of estate of his ward who was receiving care at plaintiff's facility; whether harm suffered by plaintiff because of defendant's failure to timely submit ward's application for Medicaid benefits in order to obtain available public assistance funds for cost of patient's care was foreseeable as matter of law; claim that harm to plaintiff was not foreseeable because defendant was not in privity with plaintiff; whether public policy supported recognizing that defendant owed duty to plaintiff to use reasonable care in administration and management of ward's estate; discussion of statutory (§ 45a-655 [a]) duties of conservator of estate.
- Bongiorno v. Capone 176
Contracts; statutory theft; claim that breach of contract count should have been dismissed by trial court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that plaintiff had no standing to bring breach of contract claim because it was limited liability company, and not plaintiff, that suffered any damages as result of defendant's withdrawal from checking account owned by limited liability company; whether trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over statutory theft claim; whether statutory theft claim should have been dismissed rather than decided on substantive merits; whether plaintiff lacked standing to bring statutory theft claim in his individual capacity; reviewability of unreserved claim that trial court erred in rendering judgment in favor of plaintiff on breach of contract claim without making conclusions of law regarding applicability of waiver provisions in settlement agreement.
- Boria v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision). 901
- Britton v. Commissioner of Correction 388
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal from judgment denying habeas petition; whether habeas court improperly determined that petitioner was not denied statutory and constitutional rights to due process and effective assistance of first habeas counsel; whether petitioner was denied due process when he was convicted of kidnapping without jury having been instructed pursuant to State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509) concerning whether restraint of victim exceeded that which was necessary to accomplish or complete other crimes with which petitioner was charged; harmlessness of trial court's failure to give Salamon instruction; whether habeas court improperly determined that claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel was successive and, therefore, barred by doctrine of res judicata; whether habeas court improperly determined that petitioner's statutory and constitutional rights to effective assistance of first habeas counsel were not violated; claim that first habeas counsel rendered ineffective assistance with respect to investigation of trial counsel's assistance regarding suppression of petitioner's statement to police; claim that first habeas counsel was ineffective for having failed to investigate and subpoena witnesses to demonstrate that first responders to crime scene mishandled victim's body; claim that first habeas counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to introduce exculpatory evidence to show contradiction between certain witness' statements and trial testimony; claim that first habeas counsel was ineffective by failing to raise Salamon claim.
- Brochard v. Brochard 204
Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for contempt that was based on plaintiff's alleged failure to pay his share of minor children's unreimbursed medical and extracurricular activity expenses; claim that trial court improperly denied motion for contempt in which defendant alleged that plaintiff had violated certain court orders related to mortgage on parties' former marital home; preclusion of claim under doctrine of res judicata; claim that trial court improperly determined that dissolution court had not ordered plaintiff to pay four months of past due mortgage payments and interest; claim that trial court improperly declined to hold plaintiff in contempt for having failed to pay defendant one half of tax refunds he received from individual federal and state tax returns for 2010; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to modify order that allocated parties' obligation to pay guardian ad litem's fees; whether defendant failed to prove substantial change in circum-

	<i>stances since court's allocation of parties' obligation to pay guardian ad litem's fees that necessitated reduction in defendant's 20 percent share of payment of fees; claim that trial court abused its discretion in reducing plaintiff's child support obligation; claim that trial court improperly failed to hear defendant's cross motion for modification of child support; claim that trial court improperly failed to order plaintiff to pay to defendant full amount of past due alimony for 2012.</i>	
Carolina v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)		902
Chamerda v. Opie		627
	<i>Slander of title; motion for summary judgment; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; standing; absolute immunity; whether trial court had subject matter jurisdiction over slander of title claims; whether named plaintiff had standing to bring subject claims; whether defendants' actions and statements in preparing and recording quitclaim deed and survey were absolutely privileged; whether preparation and recording of deed and survey were too remote in time from probate action to be related thereto and too dissimilar in nature to kinds of statements doctrine of absolute immunity was meant to protect as privileged; claim that trial court should have granted motions for summary because claims were time barred; whether three year statute of limitations for torts (§ 52-577) was applicable to slander of title claims; claim that equity demanded that this court recognize defendants' actions to be continuing course of conduct such that limitations period was tolled until release of certain notices of lis pendens.</i>	
CitiMortgage, Inc. v. Kurimsky (Memorandum Decision)		909
Dahle v. Stop & Shop Supermarket Co., LLC		71
	<i>Workers' compensation; appeal from decision of Compensation Review Board affirming decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner dismissing plaintiff's claim that she was entitled to temporary total disability benefits without social security offset pursuant to statute ([Rev. to 2003] § 31-307 [e]); claim that plaintiff should have been awarded benefits without social security offset because errors and delays by commissioner and board resulted in delay in obtaining compensation, which made her subject to offset; whether board erred by refusing to address plaintiff's attempt to correct past incorrect evidence and to introduce new evidence to prove that delays beyond her control made her subject to social security offset; whether board erred by failing to address commissioner's alleged statement that plaintiff's medical treatment was delayed; whether board erred in affirming commissioner's denial of plaintiff's request for financial compensation without social security offset.</i>	
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Fritzell		777
	<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court improperly denied motion to open judgment of strict foreclosure; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant received notice he was due where notice was sent to address provided by defendant on appearance form; whether motion to open was moot where it was filed approximately two months after vesting of title in plaintiff following passage of law days; whether trial court could award practical relief to defendant after passing of law days.</i>	
Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction		686
	<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly denied habeas petition; whether trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to file motion to dismiss home invasion charge to which petitioner had pleaded guilty pursuant to Alford doctrine; whether petitioner waived ineffective assistance of counsel claim after entering guilty plea under Alford doctrine; failure of petitioner to claim that guilty plea was not made knowingly, intelligently, or voluntarily, or to allege jurisdictional defect.</i>	
Dubinsky v. Black		53
	<i>Legal malpractice; malicious prosecution; risk of injury to child; whether trial court erred in granting motion for summary judgment on ground that there was probable cause to charge plaintiff with crimes of assault and risk of injury to child; claim that arresting officers lacked probable cause in light of parental justification defense under statute (§ 53a-18 [1]); claim that trial court erred in granting motion for summary judgment because arresting officers fabricated claim that defendant left red welts on son's backside; whether plaintiff could demonstrate that he would have been entitled to judgment in malicious prosecution action against arresting officers but for defendant's professional negligence.</i>	
Errichetti v. Botoff		119
	<i>Malicious erection of fence; injunction; claim that trial court erred by ordering defendants to restore area to previous condition; whether trial court properly</i>	

	<i>determined that plaintiff was entitled to injunction pursuant to statute (§ 52-480); challenge to trial court's subordinate findings in support of its determination that defendants erected fence maliciously and with intent to injure plaintiff's enjoyment of land; whether trial court's finding of absence of any real usefulness of fence was clearly erroneous; credibility of witnesses; whether trial court erred with respect to finding that fence did not fit with character of neighborhood; whether plaintiff clearly requested restoration relief in complaint; whether there was anything in record demonstrating that plaintiff ever abandoned restoration relief; whether relief ordered by trial court fell within statutory authority conferred by § 52-480; whether trial court's order was vague.</i>	
Ferrua v. Napoli Foods, Inc. (Memorandum Decision)		904
Fisk v. BL Cos.		671
	<i>Professional negligence; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment on ground of res judicata; whether prior judgment in nuisance cause of action precluded subsequent negligence claim that was not pleaded in nuisance action but was predicated on same nucleus of fact; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.</i>	
Fredo v. Fredo		252
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion to dismiss; motion for modification of child support; motion for accounting; motion to quash subpoena duces tecum; motion for attorney's fees; subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court improperly granted motion to dismiss motion for modification of child support for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court had subject matter jurisdiction to entertain motion for modification of child support pursuant to applicable statutes (§§ 46b-1 [4] and 46b-86 [a]); reviewability of claim that trial court improperly denied motion for modification of child support; whether claim was moot because there was no practical relief that this court could afford defendant; whether portions of appeal from trial court's judgment disposing of motion for accounting and granting motion to quash subpoena duces tecum were moot; whether trial court abused its discretion by awarding plaintiff \$1500 in attorney's fees pursuant to bad faith exception to general rule that prevailing party is ordinarily not entitled to collect attorney's fees from losing party; failure of trial court to make requisite findings in support of its award of attorney's fees.</i>	
Gonzalez v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)		903
Grant v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)		904
Guddo v. Guddo		283
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; contempt; reviewability of unpreserved claim that hearing on motion for contempt was unfair in that at time of the hearing, both parties were represented by same law firm, which created conflict of interest, and that law firm violated numerous professional rules of conduct; failure of plaintiff to raise claim before trial court; whether it would have been appropriate to afford extraordinary level of review to claim.</i>	
In re Madison M.		512
	<i>Termination of parental rights; appeal from termination of respondent father's parental rights pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112 [j] [3] [B] [i]) for his failure to achieve sufficient personal rehabilitation after children previously had been found to be neglected; whether trial court erred in holding that father had been provided specific rehabilitative steps in manner that satisfied requirements of § 17a-112 (j) (3) (B) (i); whether, even if father had not been provided specific steps, such omission constituted harmless error.</i>	
In re Zakai F.		752
	<i>Child custody and guardianship; petition for custody and guardianship of child by nonparent or third party; whether trial court violated respondent mother's fundamental right to care and custody of her child by denying her motion for reinstatement of guardianship without showing that she was unfit, and without finding by clear and convincing evidence that her child would be at substantial risk of physical or emotional harm if guardianship of him by petitioner were terminated; whether mother properly preserved her claims that trial court's sole reliance on best interest of child standard violated her fundamental parental rights and that trial court should have required petitioner to prove physical and emotional harm to child by clear and convincing evidence in order to defeat asserted presumption that mother, as fit parent, would act in best interest of child; whether mother's unpreserved claims that trial court failed to apply constitutional presumption that she, as fit parent, would act in best interest of her child, and</i>	

<i>that trial court's failure to apply clear and convincing evidence standard, which she claimed should apply in reinstatement of guardianship cases concerning fit parent, violated her constitutional rights to care and custody of her child, failed under third prong of State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233); whether trial court abused its discretion in finding that it was in child's best interest to remain in care, custody, and guardianship of petitioner.</i>		
Jenkins v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)		905
Jones v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)		906
Kirwan v. Kirwan		713
<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court was bound by arbitrator's finding as to defendant's gross annual income for purpose of determining child support obligation; claim that trial court's finding as to defendant's gross annual income for purpose of determining child support obligation was clearly erroneous; whether arbitrator's finding as to defendant's gross annual income for purpose of determining child support obligation was entitled to preclusive effect in trial court's adjudication of child support; whether trial court's finding that defendant earned \$400,000 in gross income from employment was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court improperly determined amount of gross rental income defendant received from property that was awarded to him; claim that trial court abused its discretion in calculating defendant's gross income when it failed to take into account his payment of life insurance premiums; whether trial court abused its discretion in rendering child support order; claim that trial court was required to provide explanation for child support order; whether claim that trial court failed to credit voluntary child support payments made by defendant was moot; claim that trial court improperly ordered defendant to pay lump sum to satisfy child support arrearage rather than permitting him to satisfy arrearage on weekly basis; whether child support arrearage guidelines were applicable to lump sum child support order; reviewability of claim that trial court should have dismissed, rather than denied, motion for contempt.</i>		
Knott v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)		902
Langston v. Commissioner of Correction.		528
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly dismissed habeas petition as untimely filed; claim that petitioner's untimely petition did not violate spirit of statute (§ 52-470 [d] and [e]) because it concerned issues that were litigated for several years; claim that good cause existed for filing untimely petition where, in withdrawing prior timely petition, petitioner claimed he was following advice of former attorney and did not understand consequences of his decision.</i>		
Li v. Yaggi		691
<i>Contracts; whether trial court's finding that plaintiffs breached real estate contract by failing to diligently pursue financing was clearly erroneous; whether trial court improperly concluded that agreement required plaintiffs to provide written notice of termination; mortgage contingency clauses, discussed; reviewability of claim that trial court's award of attorney's fees was unreasonable; reviewability of claim that plaintiffs were equitably estopped from claiming that they intended their e-mail to terminate agreement.</i>		
Lindsay v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)		903
Martinez v. Premier Maintenance, Inc.		425
<i>Employment discrimination; whether trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment; whether trial court improperly applied pretext model of analysis under McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green (411 U.S. 792) and Texas Dept. of Community Affairs v. Burdine (450 U.S. 248), rather than mixed-motive model of analysis under Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins (490 U.S. 228) in determining whether plaintiff established prima facie case of employment discrimination in violation of statute ([Rev. to 2011] § 46a-60 [a] [1]); whether trial court properly determined that there were no genuine issues of material fact as to whether defendant harbored bias or discriminatory intent on basis of plaintiff's religion; whether trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment on claim that defendant retaliated against plaintiff in violation of statute ([Rev. to 2011] § 46a-60 [a] [4]) for having referred to coworker as pastor; claim that plaintiff engaged in protected activity when he referred to coworker as pastor; claim that plaintiff raised genuine issue of material fact that his reference to coworker as pastor constituted informal complaint when defendant fired coworker.</i>		
Melendez v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)		907
Montville v. Tomaszek (Memorandum Decision)		908

Moore v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	907
Muckle v. Pressley	488
<i>Negligence; action to recover damages for diminished value of motor vehicle; claim that trial court, in awarding damages, improperly denied claim for prejudgment interest and that applicable statutes (§§ 37-3a and 37-3b) do not extinguish common-law right to prejudgment interest in this type of civil action; whether, under present statutory framework, trial court properly denied request for prejudgment interest; whether, under § 37-3a, prejudgment interest may be recovered in negligence actions; whether § 37-3b provides for award of only postjudgment interest in negligence cases; whether plaintiff was entitled to prejudgment interest pursuant to statute (§ 52-192a) that governs offers of compromise; whether current statutory framework limits automatic award of interest in negligence actions to postjudgment time periods; claim that §§ 37-3a and 37-3b have not abrogated common-law right to prejudgment interest; whether plaintiff established that prejudgment interest in negligence cases existed under common law.</i>	
Peixoto v. Peixoto	272
<i>Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment modification of alimony; whether trial court abused discretion in granting motion for modification of alimony; claim that trial court, in modifying alimony, improperly construed legal standards set forth in Dan v. Dan (315 Conn. 1); whether it was clear that trial court found that exceptional circumstances existed that warranted modification of alimony award; claim that trial court improperly held that proscription on upward modifications of alimony applied only when parties entered into alimony stipulation at time of initial dissolution; whether, at time of dissolution, trial court gave indication as to purpose of alimony award to plaintiff; whether evidence submitted at modification hearing demonstrated substantial change in circumstances.</i>	
Pitruzzello v. Dept. of Transportation (Memorandum Decision)	908
Ricardo R. v. Commissioner of Correction	787
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal from judgment denying habeas petition; whether habeas court properly determined that trial counsel rendered effective assistance; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to adequately cross-examine state's expert witness; claim that counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to consult with and present testimony of forensic psychologist; claim that counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to present expert testimony in support of alternative innocent explanation for allegations of sexual abuse.</i>	
Roberson v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	904
Robles v. West Avenue Dental, P.C.	379
<i>Negligent supervision; reviewability of claim that trial court misconstrued jury's original verdict as ambiguous and erred in returning jury for further deliberations with instructions that it could not return plaintiff's verdict without awarding plaintiff damages; failure of defendants to object to jury instructions given by court or to court's decision to return jury for further deliberations.</i>	
Seaside National Bank & Trust v. Lussier	498
<i>Foreclosure; request for continuance pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 17-47); claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to liability; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to procedural due process by denying defendant opportunity to depose plaintiff's affiant; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying request for continuance and granting motion for protective order; whether affidavit submitted by defendant in opposition to motion for summary judgment provided sufficient evidence to create genuine issue of fact regarding liability; whether trial court abused its discretion by denying defendant opportunity to depose plaintiff's affiant; whether trial court abused its discretion in overruling defendant's objection to plaintiff's motion for judgment of strict foreclosure.</i>	
Seven Oaks Enterprises, L.P. v. DeVito	534
<i>Contracts; breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; whether trial court erred in denying motions to set aside verdict and for judgment notwithstanding verdict as to breach of contract claim; claim that plaintiff company did not have power to enforce note because it could not satisfy requirements of statutory (§ 42a-3-309) provision governing enforcement of lost, destroyed, or stolen instruments; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for judgment notwithstanding verdict and in refusing to set aside verdict in favor of plaintiffs as to their claims of breach regarding management contract;</i>	

	<i>claim that neither plaintiff had right to enforce management contract; reviewability of claim that alleged breaches did not cause any loss to plaintiffs.</i>	
Smith v. BL Cos.		656
	<i>Professional negligence; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment on ground of res judicata; whether prior judgment in nuisance cause of action precluded subsequent negligence claim that was not pleaded in nuisance action but was predicated on same nucleus of fact; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.</i>	
Sosa v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)		903
State v. Bailey (Memorandum Decision)		905
State v. Bonilla (Memorandum Decision)		908
State v. Brown		806
	<i>Murder; carrying pistol without permit; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court did not ensure that trial transcript reflected each juror's oral concurrence with verdict in violation of defendant's state and federal constitutional due process rights.</i>	
State v. Carter (Memorandum Decision)		902
State v. Correa		308
	<i>Conspiracy to possess controlled substance with intent to sell; conspiracy to possess controlled substance with intent to sell by person who is not drug-dependent; conspiracy to operate drug factory; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress evidence seized from defendant's motel room after police conducted warrantless canine sniff of front door of motel room; unpreserved claim that warrantless dog sniff outside door to motel room violated defendant's rights under article first, § 7, of state constitution; claim that police were required to obtain warrant before conducting dog sniff search of pathway outside of defendant's motel room; whether defendant demonstrated reasonable expectation of privacy on outside of door to motel room, which was open, shared walkway that was located outside of structure and visible to and accessible by any member of public; whether defendant established plain error; claim that conduct of police in opening door to motel room and conducting visual sweep of room without warrant was unlawful under federal and state constitutions; whether trial court properly concluded that search was lawful under exigent circumstances exception to warrant requirement; whether probable cause existed to search motel room; whether, under totality of circumstances, reasonable, well trained police officer reasonably would have believed that immediate entry into motel room was necessary to prevent destruction of evidence.</i>	
State v. Gayle (Memorandum Decision)		906
State v. Meadows		287
	<i>Criminal violation of standing criminal protective order; threatening in second degree; claim that conviction of two counts of criminal violation of standing criminal protective order violated defendant's right to be free from double jeopardy; whether offenses charged in subject counts arose out of same act; whether defendant's conversation with victim was separable into distinct acts, each punishable as separate offenses under applicable statute (§ 53a-223a); claim that trial court erroneously instructed jury as to second count of criminal violation of standing criminal protective order by providing jury with incorrect definition of "harassing conduct," instead of using higher standard set forth in State v. Larsen (117 Conn. App. 202); claim that defendant's conviction of threatening in second degree pursuant to statute ([Rev. to 2015] § 53a-62 [a] [3]) should be reversed; whether statute violated first amendment to United States constitution; claim that true threats doctrine required that defendant possessed subjective intent to threaten victim; whether objective standard for true threats doctrine remained valid.</i>	
State v. Mendez		476
	<i>Felony murder; robbery in first degree; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly granted appellate counsel's motion for leave to withdraw appearance filed pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 62-9 [d]); failure of defendant to comply with § 62-9 (d) by filing motion for review of trial court's decision; failure of defendant to raise or adequately brief any claim that directly challenged judgment of conviction.</i>	

State v. Milledge (Memorandum Decision)	901
State v. Montanez	589
<i>Murder; conspiracy to violate dependency-producing drug laws; carrying pistol without permit; criminal possession of firearm; violation of probation; unpreserved claim that trial court improperly denied motion for mistrial after jury reported to court that there was bullet hole in window in jury deliberation room; claim that trial court abused its discretion by inquiring of jury as group as to whether jury could follow court's instruction and remain fair and impartial; claim that bullet hole incident was presumptively prejudicial to defendant's case; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that testimony about drive test survey data was admissible in evidence under test for admissibility of scientific evidence in State v. Porter (241 Conn. 57); whether trial court improperly concluded that testimony about drive test survey data was reliable and relevant under Porter; harmlessness of admission of drive test survey data.</i>	
State v. Papantoniou	93
<i>Felony murder; burglary in first degree; criminal possession of firearm; unpreserved claim that prosecutor's alleged generic tailoring argument in closing remarks to jury violated defendant's rights under state constitution to be present at trial and to confront witnesses against him; claim that certain comments of prosecutor violated defendant's rights to due process and fair trial; claim that prosecutor's alleged generic tailoring remarks deprived defendant of general due process right to fair trial.</i>	
State v. Ruiz-Pacheco	1
<i>Assault in first degree; attempt to commit murder; conspiracy to commit assault in first degree; unpreserved claim that conviction of two counts each of assault in first degree as principal and as accessory violated defendant's right against double jeopardy; claim that conviction of accessory counts should be vacated; whether acts of stabbing victims were susceptible of separation into distinct criminal acts for which defendant could be punished without violating principles of double jeopardy; whether jury reasonably could have determined that defendant was guilty as principal actor for stab or stabs he inflicted on one victim and as accessorial actor for intentionally aiding in nearly simultaneous stab or stabs defendant's brother inflicted on same victim; unpreserved claim that trial court's jury instructions on attempted murder deprived defendant of fair trial, where court utilized phrase, "engaged in anything," in three instances, read full statutory definition of general and specific intent, and allegedly failed to adequately define substantial step element for attempt; whether separate claims of error taken together deprived defendant of fair trial; unpreserved claim that trial court improperly instructed jury on defenses of self-defense and defense of others, and on lesser included offenses of assault in second degree and assault in third degree because court's instructions on self-defense permitted jury to consider lesser included offenses if state failed to disprove self-defense beyond reasonable doubt; waiver of right to challenge jury instructions; whether jury instructions constituted obvious and undebatable error so as to establish manifest injustice or fundamental unfairness pursuant to plain error doctrine; claim that multiple instances of prosecutorial impropriety during closing arguments deprived defendant of fair trial; whether prosecutor argued facts that were not in evidence or improperly appealed to emotions of jurors.</i>	
Varoglu v. Sciarrino	84
<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly found that plaintiff had purchased condominium by using funds from loan that was secured by marital home; claim that trial court improperly failed to award plaintiff more than 40 percent of net proceeds from sale of marital home; claim that trial court, in fashioning orders pertaining to distribution of equity in marital home, failed to adequately take into account plaintiff's role in preserving marital property.</i>	
Walenski v. Connecticut State Employees Retirement Commission	457
<i>Administrative appeal; subject matter jurisdiction; spousal retirement benefits pursuant to State Employees Retirement Act (§ 5-152 et seq.); claim that trial court improperly determined that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over appeal; law of case doctrine; claim that trial court improperly dismissed appeal because plaintiff appealed from final decision by administrative agency in accordance with applicable statute (§ 4-166 [5] [A] and [C]); whether appeal was taken from agency determination in contested case; whether plaintiff possessed statutory or regulatory right to have defendant Connecticut State Employees Retirement Commission decide her rights or privileges in hearing; whether governing statutes</i>	

or applicable regulations required commission to hold hearing to determine plaintiff's rights or privileges in hearing; whether fact that hearing was in fact held before commission rendered appeal as having been taken from final decision under act.

Wells Fargo Bank, National Assn. v. Ali (Memorandum Decision)	906
Wiggins v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	901