

**Cumulative Table of Cases**  
**Connecticut Appellate Reports**  
**Volume 190**

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

Adams v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	904
Almeida v. Almeida . . . . .	760
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court improperly modified dissolution judgment when it granted motion for clarification of dissolution judgment.</i>	
Bank of America, N.A. v. Defelice (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	902
Barry A. v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	903
Brocuglio v. Thompsonville Fire District #2 . . . . .	718
<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner that employee's claim for benefits under Heart and Hypertension Act (§ 7-433c) was compensable; claim that commissioner lacked jurisdiction to consider plaintiff's claim because plaintiff failed to file notice of claim required by statute (§ 31-294c [a]) within one year of when he previously had been informed by cardiologist that he suffered from pericarditis; whether plaintiff's failure to file timely notice of claim as to pericarditis barred subsequent claim for mitral valve replacement and coronary artery disease, where commissioner determined that mitral valve replacement and coronary artery disease were new injuries separate and distinct from pericarditis.</i>	
Casablanca v. Casablanca . . . . .	606
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court erroneously determined that retirement asset provision of parties' dissolution agreement was unambiguous; whether language of retirement asset provision was susceptible to more than one reasonable interpretation; whether trial court improperly granted motion to compel defendant to sign qualified domestic relations order; whether trial court improperly denied motion to open dissolution judgment on basis of mutual mistake; whether trial court improperly granted motion in limine to preclude defendant from presenting parol evidence in support of motion to open; whether remand to trial court was necessary for court to hold new hearing on parties' motions and to determine intent of parties after consideration of all available extrinsic evidence and circumstances surrounding entering of agreement.</i>	
Colby v. Colby . . . . .	140
<i>Dissolution of marriage; foreign judgment; motion for relief; motion to reargue; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for relief from certain order of California court on ground that defendant failed to timely seek relief under California law; whether trial court's finding that there was no extrinsic fraud was clearly erroneous; whether trial court properly calculated postjudgment interest on basis of entire arrearage owed by defendant.</i>	
Creative Masonry & Chimney, LLC v. Johnson (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	901
Day v. Perkins Properties, LLC . . . . .	33
<i>Nuisance per se; whether trial court properly concluded as matter of law that defendants' operation of landscaping business in residential zone in violation of local zoning regulations constituted nuisance per se; whether violation of local ordinance was sufficient in itself to constitute nuisance per se.</i>	
DeChellis v. DeChellis . . . . .	853
<i>Dissolution of marriage; arbitration; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court improperly confirmed award of attorney's fees incurred by plaintiff's counsel in complying with order of arbitrator because award did not conform to arbitration submission approved by court; claim that court committed plain error in denying motion to vacate arbitration award on grounds that award of attorney's fees did not conform to arbitration submission approved by court and violated public policy; reviewability of unpreserved claim that court improperly confirmed award of attorney's fees associated with certain motions to reargue underlying judgment because award was contrary dissolution judgment; request for this court to exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to reverse trial court's approval of agreement to arbitrate and to provide guidance to trial courts regarding proper application of statute (§ 46b-66 [c]) governing</i>	

	<i>procedure to be followed when parties in dissolution proceeding agree to binding arbitration.</i>	
DeMaria v. Bridgeport . . . . .	<i>Personal injury; claim that defendant city was liable under municipal defective highway statute (§ 13a-149) for damages plaintiff sustained in fall on sidewalk owned by city; whether trial court improperly admitted into evidence, under applicable statute (§ 52-174 [b]), certain medical records that had been written by plaintiff's primary care provider, who worked in veterans affairs hospital; claim that our Supreme Court previously had recognized standard for admissibility of medical records under § 52-174 (b) that requires only that plaintiff testify as to relevance of records and that records originated from hospital; whether medical records at issue should not have been admitted where, as here, author of records was prohibited, pursuant to applicable federal regulation (38 C.F.R. § 14.808), from providing any opinion or expert testimony in any forum and, thus, was unavailable for cross-examination; whether city was harmed by improper admission of medical records.</i>	449
Farmington-Girard, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission . . . . .	<i>Zoning; administrative appeals; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly dismissed appeals for failure to exhaust administrative remedies; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff was required to appeal to city's zoning board of appeals from decision of city's director of planning division voiding its special permit application; whether trial court properly concluded that city's zoning regulations provided director with authority to declare special permit application void; whether zoning regulations supported plaintiff's claim that only defendant city planning and zoning commission had authority to declare application void; claim that there was no statutory or regulatory avenue for appeal of decision voiding application; claim that appeal to board would have been futile.</i>	743
Ferrari v. Johnson & Johnson, Inc. . . . .	<i>Product liability; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment as to design defect and breach of warranty claims; whether expert testimony was required to establish that product was defective and that alleged defect caused plaintiff's injury; whether ordinary consumer expectation test was applicable such that jury would not need expert testimony; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment as to failure to warn claim on basis of learned intermediary doctrine.</i>	152
Fisk v. Redding . . . . .	<i>Public nuisance; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to set aside verdict; claim that jury's answers to special interrogatories in verdict form were inconsistent and could not be harmonized; claim that trial court erred in excluding evidence of subsequent remedial measures taken by defendant; whether evidence of remedial measures was inadmissible to prove defendant's liability for nuisance.</i>	99
Flagstar Bank, FSB v. Kepple . . . . .	<i>Foreclosure; claim that plaintiff lacked standing to commence foreclosure action; whether defendants failed to rebut presumption that plaintiff, as holder of note, was rightful owner of underlying debt and, therefore, had standing to commence foreclosure action; whether statement by trial court at hearing constituted finding of fact.</i>	312
Hilario Truck Center, LLC v. Kohn . . . . .	<i>Contracts; third-party beneficiary; whether plaintiff towing company that provided towing services to defendant insured motorist had standing as third-party beneficiary to bring direct breach of contract action against defendant insurance company that provided automobile liability coverage to motorist; whether plaintiff met its burden of demonstrating that trial court committed error by granting motion to dismiss.</i>	443
In re Anaishaly C. . . . .	<i>Termination of parental rights; whether there was insufficient evidence for trial court to find by clear and convincing evidence that respondent parents had each failed to achieve degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage belief that, within reasonable time, they could assume responsible position in lives of children; claim that there was no evidence that respondents' use of marijuana affected their ability to parent, and that because law concerning criminalization of marijuana had changed, that change had to be reflected in law concerning child protection; claim that there was insufficient evidence for trial court to</i>	667

<i>conclude that respondents had failed to rehabilitate on basis of their problems with domestic violence; claim that respondents' housing situation did not support trial court's ultimate conclusion that they had failed to rehabilitate; claim that trial court's conclusion that termination of respondents' parental rights was in best interests of children was improper where, as here, court found, inter alia, that respondents had made progress in their rehabilitation and that they had strong bond with children.</i>		
In re Elizabeth B. (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		902
In re Natalia M. . . . .		583
<i>Termination of parental rights; mootness; claim that trial court improperly concluded that Department of Children and Families had made reasonable efforts at reunification pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112 [j] [1]); failure of respondent father to challenge trial court's finding that he was unable or unwilling to benefit from reunification efforts, which was separate independent basis for upholding trial court's determination that requirements of § 17a-112 (j) (1) had been satisfied; whether there was practical relief that could be afforded to father; whether appeal was moot.</i>		
In re Probate Appeal of Knott . . . . .		56
<i>Probate appeal; whether trial court properly dismissed probate appeal as untimely on ground that substitute plaintiff did not appeal within time limits set by applicable statute (§ 45a-186 [a]); whether time limits for filing probate appeal were tolled by filing of application for waiver of fees pursuant to applicable statute (§ 45a-186c [b]).</i>		
Jackson v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		901
Jordan v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .		557
<i>Habeas corpus; subject matter jurisdiction; manslaughter in first degree with firearm; carrying pistol or revolver without permit; claim that respondent Commissioner of Correction entered into, and subsequently breached, purported contract to award petitioner risk reduction credit in exchange for petitioner's adherence to offender accountability plan; whether habeas court properly dismissed petitioner's breach of contract claim for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether petitioner's claim gave rise to cognizable liberty interest.</i>		
Kaminski v. Poirot. . . . .		214
<i>Legal malpractice; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment; whether trial court properly determined that action was commenced beyond three year statute of limitations (§ 52-577) applicable to tort claims.</i>		
Lavy v. Lavy . . . . .		186
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court properly determined that plaintiff's failure to disclose certain assets on financial affidavit constituted material omissions that violated parties' separation agreement, which had been incorporated into dissolution judgment; claim that plaintiff's failure to disclose assets on financial affidavit was not material omission because defendant knew about them at time of dissolution judgment; claim that trial court inflated significance of omissions by comparing their value to total value of disclosed assets in same asset category; claim that trial court's discussion of relative value of assets rendered its determination that nondisclosures were material omissions legally or logically incorrect or unsupported by record; claim that trial court's finding that plaintiff knew about undisclosed bank account at time of dissolution judgment was clearly erroneous; whether trial court properly awarded defendant statutory (§ 37-3a [a]) prejudgment interest, where defendant raised claim for prejudgment interest in posthearing brief; claim that plaintiff was denied reasonable notice and opportunity to present defense regarding defendant's request for prejudgment interest; whether trial court violated rule of practice (§ 61-11) that provides for automatic appellate stay by awarding defendant postjudgment interest after plaintiff filed appeal; claim that § 37-3a was part of mechanism for statutory (§ 52-350f) enforcement of money judgment that is limited to execution or foreclosure of lien.</i>		
Lewis v. Alves . . . . .		580
<i>Summary judgment; alleged deprivation of plaintiff's federal constitutional rights; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment in favor of defendants on plaintiff's claims that he was denied due process of law when he was not permitted to call witness and was assigned unwanted advocate at disciplinary hearing, and that he was subjected to improper conditions of confinement.</i>		

Miller v. Maurer (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	904
O'Brien-Kelley, Ltd. v. Goshen . . . . .	420
<i>Tax warrant; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant state marshal was entitled to statutory fee of 15 percent of tax, interest, fees and costs for service of alias tax warrant pursuant to statute (§ 12-162 [c]) to collect delinquent real estate tax and interest; claim that defendant was not entitled to 15 percent fee under § 12-162 because he did not execute on tax warrant or collect delinquent taxes, but merely mailed notice of tax warrant to plaintiff, which thereafter paid delinquent tax and interest to town directly before warrant was served.</i>	
Oudheusden v. Oudheusden . . . . .	169
<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly double counted certain marital asset for purposes of property division and spousal support awards; claim that trial court abused its discretion in failing to make equitable orders in division of marital estate; whether trial court deprived defendant of means with which to comply with orders; whether trial court's award of nonmodifiable, lifetime alimony to plaintiff was supported by facts in evidence; whether plaintiff's testimony at trial precluded conclusion that her physical condition and age rendered her permanently incapable of earning any income from any type of employment.</i>	
Outing v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	510
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner's trial counsel did not render ineffective assistance; claim that habeas court improperly concluded that trial counsel's decision not to present alibi defense was not constitutionally deficient; whether trial counsel's approach to handling of certain witnesses was within wide range of reasonably effective assistance; whether trial counsel's decision to forgo testimony from expert witness concerning reliability of witness identifications was reasonable tactical choice under circumstances; claim that trial counsel performed deficiently by not preserving for appellate review claim related to trial court's exclusion of expert witness' testimony regarding eyewitness identifications; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner failed to prove that appellate counsel was deficient in failing to claim in petitioner's direct appeal that trial court incorrectly denied request to present surrebuttal evidence; claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that petitioner did not prove claim of actual innocence.</i>	
Pamela Corp. v. Planning & Zoning Commission (See Farmington-Girard, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission) . . . . .	743
Patrowicz v. Peloquin . . . . .	124
<i>Contracts; statute of frauds; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying request for continuance in order to subpoena witness; whether trial court committed reversible error by permitting material variance between amount of damages alleged in complaint and amount pursued at trial without requiring plaintiffs to file amended complaint; claim challenging trial court's determinations with respect to statute of frauds defense.</i>	
Rausser v. Pitney Bowes, Inc. . . . .	541
<i>Workers' compensation; appeal from decision of Compensation Review Board affirming decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner dismissing claim for workers' compensation benefits; whether evidence amply supported commissioner's determination that for several hours plaintiff was engaged in substantial deviation from his employment activities; claim that commissioner failed to set forth factual determination as to whether, at time plaintiff sustained subject injuries, he was on direct route of his business travel; whether plaintiff failed to demonstrate that either commissioner or board misapplied law in evaluating claim for benefits; credibility determinations.</i>	
Reiner v. Reiner . . . . .	268
<i>Breach of fiduciary duty; enforcement of settlement agreement; claim that trial court, following hearing pursuant to Audubon Parking Associates Ltd. Partnership v. Barclay &amp; Stubbs, Inc. (225 Conn. 804), improperly denied motion to enforce settlement agreement; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that settlement agreement was clear and unambiguous with respect to method for calculating buyout price of plaintiff's interests in certain real properties; whether settlement agreement that is not clear and unambiguous can be enforced summarily pursuant to Audubon Parking Associates Ltd. Partnership.</i>	

Roger B. v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	817
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly denied petition for writ of habeas corpus; whether petitioner demonstrated that he was prejudiced or harmed by his trial counsel's failure to assert statute of limitations affirmative defense to charges with respect to eighteen month delay between issuance of arrest warrant and execution of arrest warrant; claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that five year statute of limitations (§ 54-193), and not State v. Crawford (202 Conn. 443), was controlling law on statute of limitations affirmative defense; claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that § 54-193 (d) tolled limitation period; claim that habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner had been elusive, unavailable and unapproachable by police once arrest warrant had been issued; whether habeas court properly found that petitioner failed to demonstrate that state could not prove that time in which arrest warrant was served was reasonable; whether habeas court properly found that trial counsel's representation of petitioner did not fall below objective standard of reasonableness; whether petitioner proved that he was prejudiced by counsel's performance.</i>	
Roger R. v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	902
Rosenthal Law Firm, LLC v. Cohen . . . . .	284
<i>Contracts; attorney's fees; discussion of Jones v. Ippoliti (52 Conn. App. 199); claim that trial court erred in concluding that plaintiff, as self-represented law firm, was precluded from recovering attorney's fees from defendant under parties' retainer agreement; claim that portion of Jones on which trial court relied in reaching its conclusion was dictum and, therefore, was improperly treated as binding precedent by trial court; whether this court could overrule precedent established by previous panel in Jones.</i>	
St. Denis-Lima v. St. Denis . . . . .	296
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court abused its discretion in ruling on motion to dismiss dissolution action without first holding evidentiary hearing; claim that certified and officially translated Brazilian document that plaintiff submitted to trial court established disputed jurisdictional fact that required evidentiary hearing on motion to dismiss; whether trial court's determination that there was final judgment of dissolution in Brazil was clearly erroneous; whether trial court abused its discretion in affording comity to dissolution judgment rendered by Brazilian court; claim that Brazilian judgment was contrary to public policy of Connecticut.</i>	
Santa Energy Corp. v. Santa (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	901
Stamford Hospital v. Schwartz . . . . .	63
<i>Debt collection; action to collect debt, pursuant to statute (§ 46b-37 [b]), for medical services that plaintiff hospital rendered to defendants' minor child; special defenses; accord and satisfaction; reviewability of claims; whether record supported findings of attorney trial referee and trial court that defendants were indebted to plaintiff and that they exhibited bad faith throughout litigation; credibility of witnesses; whether referee acted within his authority to find by preponderance of evidence that defendants were untruthful; whether trial court's decision to award plaintiff attorney's fees was legally and logically correct.</i>	
State v. Abdus-Sabur . . . . .	589
<i>Murder; criminal possession of firearm; sufficiency of evidence; whether evidence was sufficient to prove specific intent element necessary to support conviction of murder; whether trial court properly denied request to instruct jury on third-party culpability; whether defendant established direct connection between third party and offense with which defendant was charged; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly admitted evidence of uncharged misconduct of defendant's gang affiliation; whether defendant addressed in appellate brief harmfulness of allegedly improper admission of evidence; whether prejudicial effect is equivalent to harmful error or must be briefed separately.</i>	
State v. Crespo . . . . .	639
<i>Violation of probation; whether trial court improperly found defendant in violation of probation; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court violated defendant's right to confrontation when it overruled objection to probation officer's testimony without making finding of good cause; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss violation of probation charge because certain condition of probation imposed by Office of Adult Probation pursuant to statute (§ 53a-30 [b]) was inconsistent with or contradictory to certain condition of probation imposed by sentencing court; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court improperly failed to hold evidentiary hearing on veracity of certain allegations</i>	

	<i>in probation officer's arrest warrant affidavit; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for judicial disqualification; claim that certain of trial court's evidentiary rulings and colloquy with defense counsel regarding filing of motion to dismiss would lead reasonable defendant to believe that trial court would be biased toward defendant.</i>	
State v. Dojnia . . . . .		353
	<i>Assault of disabled person in second degree; unreserved claim that statute (§ 53a-60b [a] [1]) prohibiting assault of disabled person in second degree is unconstitutionally vague as applied to defendant's violent conduct toward victim; whether statute (§ 1-1f [b]) that defines physical disability is ambiguous as to whether fibromyalgia constitutes physical disability; claim that state bore burden of proving beyond reasonable doubt that victim's physical disability was caused by any particular illness or injury and that diagnosis was medically accurate; whether evidence was sufficient to prove that victim had diagnosis of fibromyalgia; whether diagnosis of fibromyalgia satisfied physical disability requirement of § 53a-60b (a) (1); whether evidence was sufficient to prove that victim suffered from physical disability for purposes of § 53a-60b (a) (1); whether defendant was deprived of right to fair trial as result of prosecutor's comment during closing argument.</i>	
State v. Fernandes (See State v. Sanchez) . . . . .		466
State v. Irizarry . . . . .		40
	<i>Assault in second degree; breach of peace in second degree; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of assault in second degree in violation of statute (§ 53a-60 [a] [1]); claim that state did not establish that defendant caused victim serious physical injury as defined by statute (§ 53a-3 [4]); claim that improper statement by prosecutor during closing argument to jury deprived defendant of constitutional right to fair trial; harmfulness of improper statement by prosecutor during closing argument to jury.</i>	
State v. Marcus H. . . . .		332
	<i>Assault in second degree with motor vehicle; risk of injury to child; reckless endangerment in first degree; reckless driving; operating motor vehicle while under influence of intoxicating liquor; interfering with officer; increasing speed in attempt to escape or elude police officer; application for public defender; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to counsel and, therefore, to due process, by denying application for appointment of public defender; whether trial court's implicit finding that defendant was not indigent was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to due process by failing to order, sua sponte, judicial marshal to remove defendant's shackles during trial; whether defendant demonstrated existence of constitutional violation that deprived him of fair trial; whether defendant's failure to object to being tried before jury in shackles was sufficient to negate compulsion necessary to establish constitutional violation; whether defendant was compelled to stand trial before jury while visibly shackled.</i>	
State v. Nalewajk . . . . .		462
	<i>Possession of narcotics with intent to sell by person who is not drug-dependent; failure to appear in first degree; motion to correct illegal sentence; mootness; whether defendant's death during pendency of appeal rendered appeal moot.</i>	
State v. Pugh . . . . .		794
	<i>Robbery in first degree; assault in first degree; carrying pistol or revolver without permit; whether evidence of defendant's identity was sufficient to support conviction; claim that trial court violated defendant's right to due process when it denied motion to dismiss charge; claim that defendant was substantially prejudiced by twenty-three month delay between time crimes were committed and date of his arrest; claim that in absence of delay in defendant's arrest, he would have been able to obtain certain employment records that would have shown he was at work when crimes took place; claim that delay in defendant's arrest resulted in faded memories of witnesses; whether defendant showed that, in absence of delay in his arrest, information pertaining to his cell phone number would have been available at trial to show that he was not in vicinity of robbery and shooting at time it occurred; whether trial court committed plain error by giving jury consciousness of guilt instruction regarding letter defendant wrote to girlfriend; claim that consciousness of guilt instruction improperly bolstered insufficient case; whether letter was highly probative of and supported reasonable inference as to whether defendant tampered with witness.</i>	

State v. Ramon A. G. . . . . 483  
*Assault in third degree; criminal violation of protective order; whether defendant properly preserved claim that trial court violated his constitutional rights to due process and to present defense by improperly declining to give jury instruction on defense of personal property with respect to assault charge; whether doctrine of implied waiver precluded substantive consideration of claim of instructional impropriety; whether improper comment of prosecutor deprived defendant of fair trial.*

State v. Riley . . . . . 1  
*Murder; whether resentencing court improperly denied motion for recusal where resentencing court was same court that presided over defendant's trial and imposed initial sentence; claim that recusal of resentencing court was required by statute (§ 51-183c), rule of practice (§ 1-22 [a]) Code of Judicial Conduct (rule 2.11 [a] [1]), and due process clauses of fifth and fourteenth amendments to United States constitution; claim that Practice Book § 1-22 provided ground for recusal independent of that provided by § 51-183c; claim that rule 2.11 (a) (1) of Code of Judicial Conduct required recusal on ground that resentencing court was biased in favor of justifying defendant's initial sentence; claim that defendant's initial sentence had anchoring effect that prevented resentencing court from approaching resentencing hearing with fully open mind that would allow it to fully consider requirement under Miller v. Alabama (567 U.S. 460) that it give mitigating weight to defendant's youth and its hallmark features when considering whether to impose functional equivalent of life imprisonment without parole; claim that resentencing court considered seventy year sentence to be inappropriate but nevertheless imposed it because defendant would be eligible for parole pursuant to legislative amendments (P.A. 15-84) to statutes applicable to sentencing of children convicted of certain felonies (§ 54-91g) and parole eligibility (§ 54-125a); claim that resentencing court was required under Supreme Court's reversal of defendant's initial sentence and remand order to find that defendant was incorrigible, irreparably corrupt or irretrievably depraved before resentencing him to life without possibility of parole; whether discussion by Supreme Court in decision reversing defendant's initial sentence about presumption against life sentence without parole that must be overcome by evidence of unusual circumstances was rendered inapplicable by enactment of P.A. 15-84; claim that Miller, Supreme Court's decision reversing defendant's sentence and P.A. 15-84 limited resentencing court's discretion by creating presumption against imposition of life sentence that could be imposed only after finding that juvenile was permanently incorrigible, irreparably corrupt or irretrievably depraved.*

State v. Rodriguez (See State v. Sanchez) . . . . . 466

State v. Sanchez . . . . . 466  
*Sale of narcotics by person who is not drug-dependent; possession of narcotics with intent to sell by person who is not drug-dependent; whether trial court improperly dismissed motions to correct illegal sentence for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that lack of drug dependency by defendants was element that state was required to plead and prove beyond reasonable doubt pursuant to statute ([Rev. to 2013] § 21a-278 [b]); whether drug dependency is affirmative defense that must be proven by defendant; whether, at time trial court dismissed motions to correct, defendants raised colorable claims; whether, in light of Supreme Court's decision in State v. Evans (329 Conn. 770), defendants' motions to correct no longer presented colorable claims of illegal sentence.*

State v. Slaughter (See State v. Sanchez) . . . . . 466

State v. Thigpen (See State v. Sanchez) . . . . . 466

State v. Thompson . . . . . 660  
*Conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; robbery in first degree; kidnapping in first degree; whether trial court properly dismissed motion to correct illegal sentence for lack of subject matter jurisdiction where motion attacked validity of guilty pleas, via claim of insufficiency of evidence, and did not challenge legality of sentence or manner in which sentence was imposed.*

State v. Turner . . . . . 693  
*Felony murder; robbery in first degree; attempt to possess narcotics; claim that defendant's due process rights were violated because trial court improperly allowed jury to base guilty verdict on legally invalid but factually supported theory that completed larceny by false pretenses, which was accomplished by bail scheme, that preceded use of force, and was part of continuous course of larcenous*

<i>conduct, could be predicate felony for robbery and felony murder; claim that larceny by false pretenses could not be predicate felony for robbery or felony murder because no force was used to obtain property; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support conviction of attempt to possess narcotics; claim that there was insufficient evidence that defendant actively attempted to possess narcotics.</i>		
Turchiano v. Roadmaster Paving & Sealing, LLC (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		902
U.S. Bank, National Assn. v. Fitzpatrick . . . . .		773
<i>Foreclosure; standing; special defenses; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss action; whether trial court correctly determined that plaintiff had standing to bring action; whether plaintiff demonstrated that it was valid holder of note and owner of the debt with standing to pursue action; whether defendant failed to satisfy his burden of proving that another party was owner of subject note and debt; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to liability; claim that genuine issues of material fact existed as to plaintiff's standing; whether defendant failed to meet his burden of demonstrating that genuine issues of material fact existed as to his equitable defenses of laches and unclean hands.</i>		
U.S. Bank Trust, N.A. v. Giblen . . . . .		221
<i>Foreclosure; motion for approval of committee sale; annulment of automatic stay by Bankruptcy Court; claim that trial court's approval of sale was void ab initio because it exceeded scope of Bankruptcy Court's order annulling bankruptcy stay; whether Bankruptcy Court's order annulling stay was intended only to permit committee to recover fees and expenses; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting committee's motion for approval of sale; reviewability of claim that certain irregularities with motion for approval of sale prevented defendants from realizing substantial amount of equity in subject property; whether defendants failed to show any injury resulting specifically from five claimed irregularities with motion for approval of sale.</i>		
Vassell v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		903
Viking Construction, Inc. v. 777 Residential, LLC . . . . .		245
<i>Contracts; whether trial court erred in rendering summary judgment in favor of cross claim plaintiffs; whether defects, errors and omissions exclusion of builder's risk policy unambiguously barred coverage; claim that defects, errors and omissions exclusion of builder's risk policy did not bar recovery because damaged windows were not part of renovation; claim that recovery for damage to windows was not barred by defects, errors and omissions exclusion of builder's risk policy because exclusion applied only to finished product, not to process implemented by subcontractor who damaged windows; claim that renovation endorsement would have been rendered meaningless if exclusion applied; whether trial court incorrectly interpreted resulting loss clause as entitling cross claim plaintiffs to coverage.</i>		
Villafane v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .		566
<i>Habeas corpus; reviewability of claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal with respect to issue of whether habeas court improperly denied motions for appointment of habeas counsel; failure of petitioner to raise claim in petition for certification to appeal; reviewability of claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal with respect to issue of whether trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance; failure to brief claim adequately.</i>		
Vitti v. Milford . . . . .		398
<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board erred as matter of law by applying version of applicable statute ([Rev. to 2009] § 7-433c) that was in effect on date of plaintiff's injury to plaintiff's claim for heart and hypertension benefits; claim that board should have applied version of § 7-433c that was in effect on date of plaintiff's hire in 1993; claim that board erred as matter of law by affirming finding of Workers' Compensation Commissioner that plaintiff's giant cell myocarditis constituted heart disease under § 7-433c; credibility of witnesses.</i>		
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Fitzpatrick . . . . .		231
<i>Foreclosure; notice requirements of mortgage; whether trial court properly determined that certain two letters together substantially complied with notice requirements in mortgage deed; whether trial court's finding that defendants did not prove special defense of laches was clearly erroneous; whether defendants established that any alleged delay by plaintiff resulted in prejudice to them; whether</i>		



*trial court's reduction in interest that accrued while first of two foreclosure actions was pending equitably addressed any delay in first foreclosure action.*

Woodbury-Correa v. Reflexite Corp. . . . . 623

*Workers' compensation; motion to preclude, appeal from decision of Compensation Review Board affirming decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner denying motion to preclude defendant employer from contesting compensability of plaintiff's injuries; whether board exceeded its authority by making new factual finding, in contradiction to that made by commissioner, that defendant had filed proper form 43 contesting liability; claim that, pursuant to statute (§ 31-249c [b]), defendant was conclusively presumed to have accepted compensability of plaintiff's injury because form 43 disclaimer was not timely filed; whether defense of impossibility applied where defendant could not commence payment within statutory time period but could provide timely notice of intent to contest liability by filing form 43.*

Zaniewski v. Zaniewski . . . . . 386

*Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly failed to use parties' net incomes in calculating its orders of child support and alimony; claim that trial court improperly ordered defendant to pay alimony in amount that exceeded ability to pay; claim that trial court abused its discretion by crafting inequitable property distribution and alimony orders; whether it was possible to ascertain what path trial court followed in crafting its support orders and dividing marital assets without engaging in pure speculation; whether defendant did all that could reasonably be expected to obtain articulation; whether unique circumstances of case warranted new trial on financial matters; whether presumption of correctness of trial court's orders applied where there was inadequate factual record and appellant did all that could reasonably be expected of him to obtain articulation of factual findings necessary to obtain review of financial orders but was thwarted, through no fault of his own, due to retirement of trial judge.*