

**Cumulative Table of Cases**  
**Connecticut Appellate Reports**  
**Volume 188**

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

<p>Andrade v. Lego Systems, Inc. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Employment discrimination; claim that defendant discriminated against plaintiff on basis of sexual orientation in violation of statute (§ 46a-60 [a] [1]); summary judgment; whether trial court properly determined that there was insufficient evidence from which reasonable jury could conclude that circumstances surrounding termination of plaintiff's employment could give rise to inference of discrimination; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.</i></p> <p>Annulli v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision). . . . .</p> <p>A1Z7, LLC v. Dombek. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Unjust enrichment; application for prejudgment remedy; whether trial court properly concluded that statute (§ 47a-26b) awarding use and occupancy payments in summary process actions did not prohibit recovery of retroactive use and occupancy payments in separate action; claim that § 47a-26b provided exclusive remedy for recovery of use and occupancy payments; whether § 47a-26b contained exclusivity provision; whether plaintiff sought to recover reasonable value of premises occupied for past time period for which § 47a-26b would not permit award; whether permitting recovery for fair value of occupancy not covered by § 47a-26b that has unjustly enriched party occupying premises in separate action and to obtain security for judgment obtained in form of attachment or garnishment frustrated purposes of summary process statute to provide expeditious process for recovery of possession of premises; claim that prior pending action doctrine warranted dismissal of unjust enrichment action; whether claims in unjust enrichment and summary process actions were different; claim that doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel barred court from granting application for prejudgment remedy; whether application for prejudgment remedy required trial court to conduct full scale trial on merits.</i></p> <p>Bank of New York Mellon v. Ruttkamp . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Foreclosure; claim that trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction due to plaintiff's lack of standing; claim that plaintiff brought this action under its corporate brand name and, thus, did not have legal capacity to sue; whether defendant effectively abandoned claim concerning plaintiff's alleged lack of standing; whether plaintiff is legal entity with legal capacity to sue; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of plaintiff on counterclaim; failure to brief claim adequately.</i></p> <p>Betts v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Habeas corpus; whether criminal trial counsel provided ineffective assistance; claim that petitioner's criminal trial counsel did not give adequate advice concerning state's pretrial plea offer; whether habeas court correctly determined that petitioner failed to establish that he was not advised of maximum penalties for pending charges or of maximum exposure to punishment if found guilty on all charges; whether habeas court correctly concluded that trial counsel advised petitioner as to maximum possible penalties for all felony charges he faced; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to advise petitioner adequately as to strength of state's case; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner was not prejudiced by trial counsel's allegedly inadequate advice in connection with state's pretrial plea offer.</i></p> <p>Cadco, Ltd. v. Doctor's Associates, Inc. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><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</i></p>	<p>652</p> <p>902</p> <p>714</p> <p>365</p> <p>397</p> <p>122</p>
--	---

	<i>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>	
Canton v. Cadle Properties of Connecticut, Inc. . . . .		36
	<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>	
Cruz v. Schoenhorn . . . . .		208
	<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>	
De Almeida-Kennedy v. Kennedy . . . . .		670
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; unallocated alimony and child support; whether trial court improperly denied in part motion for modification of unallocated alimony and child support obligation; claim that trial court abused its discretion by denying defendant's request to modify unallocated alimony and child support obligation without first making findings under child support guidelines; claim that trial court made erroneous factual finding; claim that trial court abused its discretion in finding that defendant failed to establish change in circumstances to warrant modification to unallocated alimony and child support obligation; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting in part motion for clarification and awarding plaintiff attorney's fees incurred defending defendant's motion for modification; whether record was adequate to review claim that trial court abused its discretion by granting motion for attorney's fees and expenses pending appeal.</i>	
Deroy v. Reck . . . . .		292
	<i>Legal malpractice; will execution; testamentary capacity; breach of fiduciary duty; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment on ground that plaintiff failed to provide expert testimony concerning applicable standard of care and defendants' alleged breach thereof; claim that requirement of expert testimony was obviated because defendants' conduct demonstrated such obvious and gross want of care and skill that neglect was clear even to layperson.</i>	
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Grant (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		901
Doe v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services . . . . .		275
	<i>Patients' bill of rights (§ 17a-540 et seq.); alleged violations of patients' bill of rights in connection with named plaintiff's treatment and confinement at defendant forensic psychiatric hospital; whether trial court properly concluded that civil commitment of named plaintiff, as only woman in otherwise all male maximum security unit at hospital, was not per se violation of patients' bill of rights; whether patients' bill of rights mandates that committed patients be subject to categorical gender segregation; whether imposition of per se rule would be inconsistent with purpose of patients' bill of rights; claim that trial court improperly applied standard outlined in Mahoney v. Lensink (213 Conn. 548) to determine that defendants' treatment of named plaintiff while she was committed to maximum security unit did not violate her right to humane and dignified treatment under § 17a-542; whether Mahoney makes clear that right to specialized treatment plan is part of, and not severable from, right to humane and dignified treatment; whether defendants' treatment plan was permissible and reasonable.</i>	
Fields v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		902
Firstenberg v. Madigan . . . . .		724
	<i>Child custody; motion to intervene; third-party petition for visitation; claim that trial court incorrectly construed motion to intervene as seeking custody pursuant to statute (§ 46b-57), when motion sought visitation with minor child pursuant to statute (§ 46b-59 [b]); whether petition for visitation sufficiently alleged that paternal grandfather had parent-like relationship with minor child and that child would suffer real and significant harm if trial court denied visitation; whether</i>	

*trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over purported petition for visitation; whether trial court should have rendered judgment dismissing petition rather than denying it.*

Garcia v. Cohen . . . . . 380  
*Negligence; premises liability; whether general verdict rule precluded review of claim that trial court improperly rejected request to charge jury that possessor of real property has nondelegable duty to maintain premises in reasonably safe condition.*

In re Avia M. . . . . 736  
*Termination of parental rights; whether trial court improperly concluded that petitioner, Commissioner of Children and Families, proved by clear and convincing evidence that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify respondent mother with child, that she was unable or unwilling to achieve requisite degree of personal rehabilitation and that it was in minor child's best interest to terminate her parental rights; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of applicable law on issues.*

In re Bianca K. . . . . 259  
*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.*

In re Malachi E. . . . . 426  
*Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court erred with respect to dispositional phase of proceedings when it improperly determined that termination of respondent mother's parental rights was in best interest of child; claim that trial court improperly relied entirely on its adjudicatory determination that mother had failed to achieve sufficient personal rehabilitation in determining whether termination of parental rights was in best interest of child; whether trial court's best interest determination was clearly erroneous; whether there was evidence presented to support trial court's determination that termination of parental rights was in best interest of child.*

In re Probate Appeal of Kusmit . . . . . 196  
*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.*

Juan G. v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . . 241  
*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)*

Kaminsky v. Commissioner of Emergency Services & Public Protection . . . . . 109  
*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.*

Lopes v. Ferrari . . . . . 387  
*Child custody; motion for psychological evaluation; claim that trial court abused its discretion when it denied motion for psychological evaluation of defendant; whether plaintiff set forth any facts to substantiate reasons for psychological evaluation; claim that trial court's custody determination did not comply with applicable statutes (§§ 46b-56 and 46b-56a [b]); whether trial court articulated basis of decision; whether it was clear from trial court's decision that it considered § 46b-56 and child's best interests; whether plaintiff met burden to request trial court to further articulate its reasoning or best interests determination; claim that, by giving defendant final decision-making authority, trial court essentially gave defendant sole custody.*

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;*

	<i>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.</i>	
Manzo-III v. Schoonmaker . . . . .		343
	<i>Legal malpractice; fraudulent misrepresentation; motion to reargue; whether trial court properly concluded that action was barred by applicable statute of limitations (§ 52-577); whether statute of limitations was tolled pursuant to doctrine of continuous representation; claim that trial court misapplied rule in DeLeo v. Nusbaum (263 Conn. 588) regarding continuous representation doctrine and tolling of statute of limitations; whether trial court properly concluded that attorney-client relationship between plaintiff and defendant law firm ended on certain date; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to reargue.</i>	
Matthew C. v. Commissioner of Children & Families. . . . .		687
	<i>Administrative appeal; child neglect; appeal from decision by defendant Commissioner of Children and Families denying request for hearing to challenge decision to substantiate allegations that plaintiff neglected his two minor children; claim that trial court improperly declined to equate certain provision (§ 22-12-4) of Policy Manual of Department of Children and Families, as derived from department regulation (§ 17a-101k-7), with doctrine of collateral estoppel; claim that trial court improperly decided administrative appeal on basis not decided by defendant's administrative hearing officer; claim that because hearing officer dismissed request for substantiation hearing only on basis of collateral estoppel, court was not permitted to consider applicability of § 22-12-4 of policy manual; claim that trial court was limited to considering same conclusions of law that administrative body reached; whether trial court properly determined that department regulation and policy manual provision were not substantively identical to common-law doctrine of collateral estoppel and that it was proper to apply them; whether trial court properly applied applicable regulation rather than common-law doctrine in evaluating request for hearing; claim that trial court improperly dismissed request for substantiation hearing; whether dismissal of request for substantiation hearing pursuant to department regulation violated plaintiff's right to fundamental fairness.</i>	
Maurice v. Chester Housing Associates Ltd. Partnership. . . . .		21
	<i>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.</i>	
McClain v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .		70
	<i>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.</i>	
Melendez v. Spin Cycle Laundromat, LLC . . . . .		807
	<i>Negligence; whether trial court properly denied motion to set aside verdict; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.</i>	
Miller v. Board of Education. . . . .		373
	<i>Quantum meruit; unjust enrichment; motion to dismiss; accidental failure of suit statute (§ 52-592 [a]); whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss action as untimely; whether plaintiff brought action for same cause within one year following determination of prior original action, as required under § 52-592.</i>	
Miller v. Bridgeport (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		901
Mitchell v. State . . . . .		245
	<i>Petition for new trial; attempt to commit murder; conspiracy to commit murder; kidnapping in first degree; conspiracy to commit kidnapping in first degree;</i>	

*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.*

Nappo v. Nappo . . . . . 574

*Dissolution of marriage; motion for contempt; motion for modification; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting motion for modification and increasing defendant's alimony payments; whether trial court, in calculating amount of alimony, erroneously found increase in defendant's weekly net income; whether trial court correctly determined that financial contributions to defendant from his current wife constituted gifts rather than loans; claim that modified alimony award was excessive; whether trial court's failure to attribute certain rental income to plaintiff was clearly erroneous; reviewability of claim that it was unfair for trial court to award plaintiff attorney's fees and travel expenses as sanction; whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering defendant to commence paying interest on plaintiff's share of certain bond proceeds if bond was not released on or before certain date; whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering defendant to reimburse plaintiff for certain bank wire transfer charges; whether remedial order was proper even though defendant's violation of court's alimony order was not wilful because it compensated plaintiff for minor alimony deficiency.*

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
<i>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.</i>	
Rivera v. Patient Care of Connecticut . . . . .	203
<i>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.</i>	
Ross v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	251
<i>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.</i>	
Smalls v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	525
<i>Habeas corpus; murder; risk of injury to child; criminal possession of firearm; claim that prior habeas counsel was ineffective for failing to raise claim that petitioner's trial counsel was ineffective for failing to fully explain plea offer to petitioner; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner failed to establish deficient performance by trial counsel or prior habeas counsel; whether habeas court correctly determined that petitioner was not prejudiced by any alleged deficient performance of trial counsel or prior habeas counsel.</i>	
Stamford v. Rahman. . . . .	1
<i>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.</i>	
Stanley v. Scott (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	901
State v. Dawson . . . . .	532
<i>Criminal possession of pistol or revolver; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support defendant's conviction of criminal possession of pistol or revolver because there was insufficient evidence of defendant's knowledge of gun and no evidence to prove his dominion or control over it; claim that state improperly</i>	

relied on DNA evidence alone to prove that defendant knew of gun's presence and where it was located; claim that DNA evidence was insufficient due to questionable reliability of testing small sample; claim that even if state produced sufficient evidence that defendant knew of gun's presence, it failed to adduce any evidence of his intent to exercise dominion or control of gun; claim that defendant was deprived of his constitutional right to fair trial as result of prosecutorial improprieties during closing argument; whether prosecutor's incomplete and incorrect statement of law of constructive possession deprived defendant of his right to fair trial; claim that state mischaracterized DNA evidence and improperly suggested that there was no evidence to support defense's theory that his DNA on gun or ammunition came to be there in some incidental or accidental fashion.

State v. Dunbar . . . . . 635

Violation of probation; claim that there was insufficient evidence for trial court to find that defendant violated her probation; credibility of witnesses; reviewability of unpreserved claim that defendant's right to due process was violated because trial court failed to conduct analysis of reliability of out-of-court identification of defendant pursuant to Neil v. Biggers (409 U.S. 188); failure to provide adequate record for review; reviewability of unpreserved claim that defendant's due process right to confront adverse witness was violated because trial court failed to balance defendant's interest in confronting confidential informant against state's reasons for not producing informant at hearing and reliability of proffered hearsay; whether record was inadequate to review unpreserved due process claim because defendant failed to request that trial court conduct balancing test pursuant to State v. Shakir (130 Conn. App. 458).

State v. Gonzalez . . . . . 304

Home invasion; sexual assault in first degree; risk of injury to child; whether there was sufficient evidence to support conviction of home invasion; whether trial court properly denied motion for judgment of acquittal on count of home invasion; claim that defendant was entitled to new trial because he was deprived of constitutional rights to fair trial and to be heard by counsel at close of evidence; claim that format of prosecutor's closing argument to jury was improper; reviewability of claim that prosecutor improperly raised new issues and mischaracterized DNA and fingerprint evidence during rebuttal argument to jury; claim that defendant was prejudiced by prosecutor's comment to jury that fingerprints on window could have been there for 100 years; unpreserved claim that defendant was entitled to new trial because his counsel was not given opportunity to counter prosecutor's statement in her rebuttal argument to jury that defendant was only person in Connecticut who could have been contributor to certain mixture of DNA; claim that defendant was entitled to new trial on charge of home invasion because prosecutor misled jury during closing argument about elements of that crime.

State v. Gray-Brown. . . . . 446

Felony murder; robbery in first degree; carrying pistol without permit; whether trial court properly denied motion to suppress evidence police seized during search of defendant's bedroom; whether trial court's findings that defendant's mother had actual authority to consent to search and whether her consent was voluntary were clearly erroneous; claim that defendant established sufficiently exclusive control of bedroom so as to render ineffective mother's consent to search; whether trial court reasonably concluded that evidence police seized from defendant's bedroom was relevant and that its probative value outweighed any undue prejudice; whether evidence was sufficient to prove that firearm used in shooting had barrel less than twelve inches in length, which was required to sustain conviction of carrying pistol without permit in violation of statute (§ 29-35 [a]); whether trial court properly determined that defendant was not entitled to jury instruction on third-party culpability; whether defendant established direct connection between third party and offense with which defendant was charged; whether trial court abused its discretion when it declined to question juror, who had been dismissed after jury returned verdict, about claim that juror became aware that defendant was incarcerated when juror allegedly saw defendant being transported to court by correctional officer.

State v. Hutton . . . . . 481

Murder; whether trial court violated defendant's right to confrontation when it admitted into evidence, pursuant to State v. Whelan (200 Conn. 743), witness' prior videotaped statement to police in which witness identified defendant as shooter; whether witness' refusal to provide any verbal responses to counsels' questions

	<i>rendered witness functionally unavailable to testify; claim that defendant lacked any meaningful opportunity to cross-examine witness and to expose infirmities in videotaped statement or reasons behind witness' recalcitrance or lack of memory; whether erroneous admission of videotaped statement was harmless beyond reasonable doubt.</i>	
State v. Ruiz . . . . .		413
	<i>Violation of probation; motion to suppress; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress one-on-one showup identification; whether trial court properly found that identification procedure was not unnecessarily suggestive; claim that trial court improperly found that defendant violated condition of his probation; whether there was sufficient evidence to support trial court's finding that defendant committed act of threatening in second degree in violation of statute (§ 53a-62 [a] [1]); claim that trial court abused its discretion in revoking defendant's probation.</i>	
State v. Simmons . . . . .		813
	<i>Assault in first degree; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; carrying pistol without permit; whether state's promise to witness of immunity from prosecution for any perjury witness might commit in his testimony plainly violated strong public policy reflected in statutory (§ 54-47a [b]) prohibition against immunizing perjured testimony and undermined perception of and confidence in system of justice; whether state's improper grant of immunity to witness warranted exercise of Appellate Court's supervisory authority over due administration of justice; whether dearth of authority on question of whether grant of immunity constituted structural error and Appellate Court's practice of not deciding thorny constitutional questions when possible made it unnecessary to decide whether defendant's constitutional rights were violated by improper immunity agreement or whether structural error doctrine was applicable; whether Appellate Court's exercise of supervisory powers over administration of justice to remand case for new trial made it unnecessary to resolve difficult and close question of whether defendant was harmed by witness' testimony; whether Appellate Court's exercise of supervisory powers over administration of justice was warranted because state's improper immunity agreement with witness gave witness license to commit perjury and directly implicated perception of integrity of justice system; claim that Appellate Court's exercise of supervisory authority to reverse conviction was improper; claim that it was unclear that Appellate Court has supervisory power over administration of justice; claim that defendant at trial waived any challenge to improper immunity agreement.</i>	
State v. Weathers . . . . .		600
	<i>Murder; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; carrying pistol without permit; whether trial court's rejection of affirmative defense of mental disease or defect was reasonably supported by evidence; claim that trial court erred as matter of law in deciding issue without aid of expert testimony; claim that trial court improperly rejected testimony of defendant's experts; whether trial court was entitled to adopt nonpsychiatric explanation for defendant's conduct; whether trial court reasonably could have found that evidence pertaining to expert's understanding of statutory insanity test undermined value of expert's opinions; whether trial court reasonably could have found that expert failed to account adequately for defendant's statements to police; whether trial court's express subordinate factual findings were clearly erroneous.</i>	
Strano v. Azzinaro . . . . .		183
	<i>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.</i>	
Thomas v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		902
Wolyniec v. Wolyniec . . . . .		53
	<i>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;</i>	



*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.*