

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 188

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

<p>Cadco, Ltd. v. Doctor's Associates, Inc.</p> <p><i>Summary judgment; alleged violations of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); whether trial court properly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact that defendants' conduct did not amount to unfair act or practice in violation of CUTPA; whether plaintiff's claims met any prong of cigarette rule for determining whether practice violates CUTPA; whether trial court properly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether defendants' conduct constituted deceptive act or practice under CUTPA; whether there was evidence of any misrepresentation, omission, or practice by defendants likely to mislead plaintiff; whether defendants were under duty to inform plaintiff regarding bid solicitation; whether trial court erred in concluding that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether defendants were unjustly enriched to plaintiff's detriment; whether there was evidence that defendants did not compensate plaintiff fully for benefit received.</i></p> <p>Canton v. Cadle Properties of Connecticut, Inc.</p> <p><i>Petition for appointment of receiver of rents; claim that plain reading of statute (§ 12-163a) does not limit required, enumerated utility payments to those obligated to be paid by owner of property and, thus, that trial court should not have approved updated interim accounting because receiver did not reimburse intervening defendant tenant for its utility expenditures; whether trial court properly determined that, pursuant to § 12-163a, receiver is mandated to pay only utility bills that are obligation of owner, not those incurred by tenants of property.</i></p> <p>Cruz v. Schoenhorn</p> <p><i>Legal malpractice; summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motions for summary judgment; whether plaintiff's action was brought within applicable statute of limitations (§ 52-577); claim that trial court erred in not considering plaintiff's affidavit in adjudicating motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court misconstrued argument of plaintiff as to date that attorney-client relationship with defendants ended.</i></p> <p>In re Bianca K.</p> <p><i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court erred in concluding that respondent mother failed to achieve requisite degree of personal rehabilitation required by statute (§ 17a-112 [j] [3] [B] [i]); whether trial court improperly determined that termination of parental rights was in best interest of minor child.</i></p> <p>In re Probate Appeal of Kusmit</p> <p><i>Probate appeal; appeal by plaintiff coadministrators of estate of decedent to trial court from decision of Probate Court allocating distribution of certain disputed attorney's fees; whether this court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over appeal; whether plaintiffs lacked standing to challenge judgment of trial court; whether plaintiffs were classically aggrieved by judgment of trial court.</i></p> <p>Juan G. v. Commissioner of Correction</p> <p><i>Habeas corpus; risk reduction earned credit; whether habeas court improperly dismissed claim that retroactive revocation of petitioner's risk reduction earned credits violated ex post facto clause of United States constitution; motion for summary reversal of habeas court's dismissal of petition for writ of habeas corpus with respect to petitioner's ex post facto claim; whether appeal was controlled by Breton v. Commissioner of Correction (330 Conn. 462)</i></p> <p>Kaminsky v. Commissioner of Emergency Services & Public Protection</p> <p><i>Declaratory judgment; claim that trial court erred in denying request for declaratory ruling that certain firearms were improperly seized and withheld from plaintiff by defendant and, thus, that plaintiff was entitled to return of those firearms; claim that trial court erred in finding that plaintiff's firearms were not legally held by him because they were not exempt from transfer or registration requirements for assault weapons.</i></p>	<p>122</p> <p>36</p> <p>208</p> <p>259</p> <p>196</p> <p>241</p> <p>109</p>
--	---

- MacCalla v. American Medical Response of Connecticut, Inc. 228
Promissory estoppel; motion for nonsuit; claim that trial court erred in dismissing plaintiffs' case solely on basis of conduct of plaintiffs' counsel at depositions; claim that trial court erred in dismissing claim of one plaintiff individually who had complied with discovery obligations and was not named in motion for nonsuit; whether actions of plaintiffs' counsel at plaintiffs' depositions were unprofessional and unacceptable; whether defendant sought sanctions solely based on conduct of plaintiffs' counsel.
- Maurice v. Chester Housing Associates Ltd. Partnership. 21
Writ of error; claim that trial court exceeded scope of its authority by awarding attorney's fees against nonparty for out-of-court conduct; claim that trial court abused its discretion in awarding attorney's fees as sanction against plaintiff in error for out-of-court litigation misconduct; whether trial court was required to find that bad faith conduct of plaintiff in error had effect on outcome of litigation in order to award attorney's fees.
- McClain v. Commissioner of Correction 70
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether petitioner failed to show that he was prejudiced by trial counsel's failure to investigate and present third-party culpability defense; whether petitioner failed to show that he was prejudiced by counsel's failure to present evidence of initial segment of video recorded police interview of witness for state; whether habeas court properly rejected petitioner's claim of actual innocence; claim that testimony of witnesses at habeas trial constituted newly discovered evidence; whether petitioner failed to establish by clear and convincing evidence that he was innocent of murder for which he was convicted and that no reasonable fact finder would find him guilty of crime.
- Miller v. Bridgeport (Memorandum Decision) 901
- Mitchell v. State 245
Petition for new trial; attempt to commit murder; conspiracy to commit murder; kidnapping in first degree; conspiracy to commit kidnapping in first degree; sexual assault in first degree; conspiracy to commit sexual assault in first degree; assault in first degree; conspiracy to commit assault in first degree; criminal possession of firearm; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying request for leave to file late petition for certification to appeal from denial of petition for new trial; whether state or court are required to provide petitioner with written notice of appeal procedures and statutory certification requirement; claim that trial court improperly denied request for leave to file late petition for certification on basis of merits of appeal; whether trial court afforded due regard to reasons for delay in filing request.
- Parnoff v. Aquarian Water Co. of Connecticut (AC 40383). 153
Trespass; negligent infliction of emotional distress; intentional infliction of emotional distress; invasion of privacy; violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); summary judgment; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to trespass claims because defendants use of certain easement on plaintiff's property was unreasonable; whether trespass claims were moot; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment as to negligent infliction of emotional distress claims; whether trial court properly determined that negligent infliction of emotional distress claims were barred by applicable two year statute of limitations (§ 52-584); whether continuing course of conduct doctrine tolled statute of limitations; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to invasion of privacy by intrusion on seclusion claims; whether alleged tortious conduct of defendants established claim of intrusion of seclusion; whether plaintiff proved intentional intrusion on his solitude or seclusion that would be highly offensive to reasonable person; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to intentional infliction of emotional distress claims; whether defendants' conduct was sufficiently extreme and outrageous to form basis for intentional infliction of emotional distress claim; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment in favor of defendant water company as to CUTPA claim; whether plaintiff failed to allege and demonstrate that he suffered ascertainable loss; whether punitive damages and attorney's fees are sufficient to fulfill ascertainable loss requirement under CUTPA; whether emotional distress constitutes ascertainable loss of money or property for purposes of CUTPA.

Parnoff v. Aquarian Water Co. of Connecticut (AC 40109). 145
False arrest; violation of federal law (42 U.S.C. § 1983); reviewability of claims challenging trial court’s granting of motion for summary judgment on basis of distinctly different theory from theory plaintiff argued before trial court and on which trial court actually rendered summary judgment.

Patty v. Planning & Zoning Commission 115
Zoning; appeal from decision by defendant planning and zoning commission granting application for amendment to existing special permit and for site plan approval to allow installation of artificial turf field at school; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly concluded that commission’s approval did not include alleged trailers on property that were prohibited by zoning regulations; failure of plaintiffs to raise claim before commission.

Quinones v. R. W. Thompson Co. 93
Workers’ compensation; appeal from decision of Compensation Review Board, which affirmed decision of Workers’ Compensation Commissioner denying plaintiff’s motion to preclude defendant from contesting extent of plaintiff’s injuries; whether board improperly found that there was no error when commissioner rejected alleged stipulation that case be decided on original record after former commissioner died; claim that substitute commissioner improperly opened record because parties stipulated that case would be decided on original record before former commissioner, and that substitute commissioner improperly ignored stipulation and conducted hearing de novo; claim that because defendant failed to file form 43 to contest compensability of plaintiff’s claim for certain workers’ compensation benefits, defendant failed to comply with applicable statute ([Rev. to 2009] § 31-294c) and was, therefore, precluded from contesting compensability or extent of plaintiff’s claimed injury.

Rivera v. Patient Care of Connecticut 203
Workers’ compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed decision of Workers’ Compensation Commissioner approving request to transfer plaintiff’s benefit status from temporary partial disability to permanent partial disability on basis of medical examination that determined that plaintiff had reached maximum medical improvement; claim that commissioner failed to require defendant to prove that plaintiff had work capacity; claim that commissioner improperly shifted burden to plaintiff to prove she did not have work capacity.

Ross v. Commissioner of Correction 251
Habeas corpus; murder; carrying pistol or revolver without permit; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to call toxicologist as expert witness to present adequate intoxication defense; claim that trial counsel’s failure to object to improprieties in prosecutor’s closing arguments constituted ineffective assistance; whether trial counsel’s decision not to present expert witness to testify about effects of drugs petitioner ingested was reasonable trial strategy; whether habeas court properly determined that trial counsel was not ineffective in failing to object to improprieties in prosecutor’s closing arguments; whether collateral estoppel precluded relitigation of issue that was addressed and decided in petitioner’s direct appeal.

Stamford v. Rahman. 1
Foreclosure; motion for supplemental judgment; motion to open; fraud; claim that trial court erred in opening supplemental judgment beyond statutory (§ 52-212a) four month limitation period on basis of fraud; whether trial court’s finding that defendant bank satisfied second factor set forth in Varley v. Varley (180 Conn. 1) requiring diligence in trying to discover and expose fraud was clearly erroneous; whether trial court improperly found that defendant bank, as holder of first mortgage on subject property, had no reason to be aware of recordation of any subsequent mortgages; whether trial court erred in determining that defendant bank was entitled to notice of proceedings on motion for supplemental judgment, despite its default for failure to appear; whether defendant bank failed to demonstrate how its access to information regarding fraudulent satisfaction was limited in any way during present action; whether trial court lacked authority to open supplemental judgment more than four years after it was rendered because judgment was not obtained by any fraud on part of codefendant bank; whether fraud committed by defaulted party years prior to litigation can support opening of judgment following expiration of four month period.

Stanley v. Scott (Memorandum Decision) 901

Strano v. Azzinaro 183

Intentional infliction of emotional distress; whether trial court properly granted motion to strike revised complaint alleging claims of intentional infliction of emotional distress; whether defendants' alleged conduct toward plaintiffs was extreme and outrageous.

Wolyniec v. Wolyniec 53

Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment orders; claim that trial court abused its discretion in permitting defendant to remain in residence owned by plaintiff until defendant received payment in full of support arrearage owed by plaintiff; whether stipulation incorporated into parties' dissolution judgment unambiguously linked monetary and residential support; whether trial court's remedial order to effectuate judgment of dissolution was supported by competent evidence; claim that trial court erred in failing to find that defendant should be barred by laches from recovering support arrearage; whether evidence was admitted from which trial court could have found that plaintiff was prejudiced by defendant's delay in filing motion for contempt.