

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 198

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

<p>Ahrens v. Hartford Florists' Supply, Inc.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Product liability; motion to dismiss; personal jurisdiction; motion to implead; claim that trial court erred in granting motions to dismiss third-party complaint; claim that trial court applied incorrect standard when it found that strict compliance with statutes (§§ 52-102a and 52-577a (b)) was required when impleading third party into product liability case; whether trial court erred in concluding that third-party plaintiff must strictly comply with §§ 52-102a and 52-577a (b); claim that trial court erred in concluding that one year time limitation in § 52-577a implicated jurisdiction of court.</i></p> <p>In re Corey C.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Termination of parental rights; whether Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify respondent father with minor child; claim that department failed to offer father or child's mother any feedback with respect to their progress in therapeutic family time program; claim that department failed to offer parents adequate smoking cessation services; claim that trial court improperly found that father was unable or unwilling to benefit from department's reasonable efforts to reunify him with child; whether evidence was insufficient to support trial court's conclusion that father failed to achieve sufficient rehabilitation pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112 (j) (3) (B) (i)); whether trial court, in adjudicatory findings, improperly compared father's suitability as parent, and that of mother, to that of foster parent.</i></p> <p>Peck v. Statewide Grievance Committee</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Attorney discipline; whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss appeal, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, that challenged defendant's imposition of discipline against plaintiff attorney; whether defendant was deprived of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Disciplinary Counsel v. Elder (325 Conn. 378) to adjudicate grievance against plaintiff that was filed beyond six year limitation period in applicable rule of practice (§ 2-32 (a) (2) (E)).</i></p> <p>Prime Bank v. Vitano, Inc.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Statute of limitations; guarantee of promissory note; whether trial court properly found that plaintiff's cause of action to recover from defendant guarantor on borrower's note accrued when borrower defaulted on note payments and was barred by applicable statute of limitations (§ 52-576); claim that trial court erred in failing to conclude that there was acknowledgment of debt by defendant, thereby tolling statute of limitations.</i></p> <p>Pursuit Partners, LLC v. Reed Smith, LLP</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Breach of contract; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly concluded that defendant law firm was bound by confidentiality provision of settlement agreement only to extent of its client; claim that language of settlement agreement, coupled with defendant's signature on agreement, was ambiguous and created genuine issue of material fact regarding capacity in which defendant signed agreement; whether trial court properly concluded that finding in related action had collateral estoppel effect.</i></p> <p>Rosario v. Rosario</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Dissolution of marriage; motion for contempt; motion for continuance; claim that because trial court denied motions for contempt, there were no pending motions before court on which it could find plaintiff in contempt; claim that plaintiff did not receive motion for contempt by service of process.</i></p> <p>S. A. v. D. G.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Application for civil protection order pursuant to statute (§ 46b-16a); claim that trial court abused its discretion by excluding evidence of certain audio and videotape recordings at hearing on application for protection order; claim that trial court improperly issued protection order despite fact that defendant was not arrested for violating any of statutory provisions set forth in statute (§ 54-1k) governing criminal protective orders; claim that trial court improperly issued</i></p>	<p>24</p> <p>41</p> <p>233</p> <p>136</p> <p>1</p> <p>83</p> <p>170</p>
--	---

protection order partly on basis of defendant having videotaped plaintiff performing her duties as public employee; reviewability of inadequately briefed constitutional claim; whether record was adequate for review of unpreserved claim.

Scholz v. Epstein 197

Motion to dismiss; statutory theft; subject matter jurisdiction; absolute immunity; litigation privilege; whether trial court properly granted defendant's motion to dismiss and determined that defendant attorney was protected by absolute immunity from plaintiff's action for theft pursuant to statute (§ 52-564); claim that trial court improperly determined that defendant was absolutely immune from liability for statutory theft where some of defendant's alleged criminal conduct was perpetrated outside scope of judicial proceedings.

State v. Marrero 90

Home invasion; burglary in first degree; assault in second degree; whether defendant was denied due process right to fair trial as result of prosecutorial improprieties; claim that prosecutor used excessive leading questions during direct examination of victim; reviewability of claim that prosecutor improperly refreshed witness' recollection by showing witness document that was different from document he purported to show witness; claim that prosecutor improperly commented during closing argument about victim's inconsistent statements as to cause of her injuries; whether trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence recordings of defendant's phone calls to incarcerated girlfriend; claim that trial court improperly prevented defendant from exploring state's ability to authenticate his voice on recordings; claim that trial court abused its discretion by instructing jury on consciousness of guilt.

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Melahn. 151

Foreclosure; whether appeal from trial court's striking of special defenses was taken from final judgment; whether trial court relied on making, validity and enforcement test as expounded in U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Blowers (332 Conn. 656); whether claim that plaintiff failed to send defendant timely notice of entry of judgment of foreclosure sufficiently related to enforcement of note or mortgage.