

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 192

Nonhuman Rights Project, Inc. v. R.W. Commerford & Sons, Inc. 36
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly declined to issue writ of habeas corpus pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-24 [a] [1] and [2]); whether habeas court properly concluded that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner lacked standing to bring habeas petition on behalf of elephants; whether elephants, not being persons, lacked standing to file habeas petition; whether petitioner failed to establish next friend standing; whether habeas corpus relief was intended to apply to nonhuman animal; whether, pursuant to statute (§ 52-466 [a]), only person is authorized to file application for writ of habeas corpus.
State v. Marsan. 49
Burglary in third degree; larceny in sixth degree; motion to suppress; whether there was sufficient evidence to support conviction of burglary in third degree; whether defendant was licensed and privileged to be in victim's home when she committed larceny; whether license was explicitly or implicitly revoked; whether state presented evidence from which jury reasonably could have concluded that defendant committed larceny in manner likely to terrorize victim or occupants in victim's home; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress statements that defendant made to police detectives in her home; whether defendant was in custody and entitled to warnings pursuant to Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436) when she was questioned by detectives; whether reasonable person in defendant's position would have felt that she was in custody for purposes of Miranda; whether fact that defendant was suspect at time of encounter with detectives transformed encounter into custodial interrogation.
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Caldrello. 1
Foreclosure; standing; claim that trial court erred in concluding that no genuine issue of material fact existed with respect to plaintiff's standing and in rendering summary judgment as to liability in plaintiff's favor; whether plaintiff met its evidentiary burden and raised presumption that it was holder of note and rightful owner of debt; whether plaintiff was successor by merger to original holder of subject note; whether, under federal banking law (12 U.S.C. § 215a [e]), all of rights in note of original holder automatically transferred to plaintiff without need for any endorsement; whether defendant's submissions in opposition to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment failed to satisfy her burden to rebut, with competent evidence, presumption that plaintiff, as holder of note, was also rightful owner of debt and had standing to bring foreclosure action; whether defendant's submissions in opposition to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment as to liability lacked adequate evidentiary foundation; whether defendant presented evidence that some entity other than plaintiff owned note at time action was commenced or at any time thereafter; reviewability of claims; failure to provide adequate record for review of claims or to brief claims adequately.