

**Cumulative Table of Cases**  
**Connecticut Appellate Reports**  
**Volume 199**

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

<p>Amity Partners v. Woodbridge Associates, L.P. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Contracts; summary judgment; best evidence rule; claim that trial court improperly determined that best evidence rule barred plaintiff's reliance on certain deposition testimony in support of its opposition to motion for summary judgment; whether plaintiff failed to satisfy its burden, pursuant to applicable rule (§ 10-3) of Connecticut Code of Evidence, to prove that deposition testimony was sufficient to establish former existence, present unavailability and contents of certain document.</i></p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Brown v. Brown . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court properly granted postjudgment motion for reimbursement of unallocated support; whether language of separation agreement that was incorporated into dissolution judgment was clear and unambiguous; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to modify child support when it concluded that reduction in earned income did not constitute substantial change in circumstances.</i></p>	<p>134</p>
<p>Carpenter v. Daar . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Medical malpractice; motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction; whether plaintiff could cure defect in opinion letter by filing supplemental affidavit of opinion author rather than amending complaint; whether opinion letter of similar health care provider was legally insufficient under statute (§§ 52-190a (a) and 52-184c (b) and (c)) where author of opinion letter was specialist rather than general dentist and did not teach or practice general dentistry.</i></p>	<p>367</p>
<p>Carrico v. Mill Rock Leasing, LLC. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Negligence; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly determined that counts against defendant alleged premises liability and not ordinary negligence; whether plaintiff alleged defendant owed duty because it owned or controlled premises or because that duty arose from snow services agreement it had with third-party land possessor.</i></p>	<p>252</p>
<p>Chelsea Groton Bank v. Belltown Sports, LLC . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Foreclosure; whether defendants could meet their burden of proving evidentiary basis to establish existence of genuine issue of material fact regarding unclean hands special defense; whether trial court properly determined that plaintiff's alleged misconduct failed to sufficiently relate to making, validity, or enforcement of mortgage.</i></p>	<p>294</p>
<p>Cohen v. Postal Holdings, LLC. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Summary judgment; negligence; private nuisance; whether defendant maintained control of property pursuant to terms of ground lease.</i></p>	<p>312</p>
<p>D. S. v. R. S. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Application for relief from abuse; domestic violence restraining order; whether trial court erred in issuing domestic violence restraining order pursuant to statutory (§ 53a-181d) definition of stalking rather than definition of stalking in Princess Q. H. v. Robert H. (150 Conn. App. 105); reviewability of claim that trial court erroneously relied on testimony that plaintiff gave on behalf of minor child; harmlessness of trial court's ruling.</i></p>	<p>11</p>
<p>Fazio v. Fazio . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court improperly granted motion to modify or to terminate alimony; claim that trial court erred by concluding that it was bound by finding of cohabitation made by prior judge in case; whether trial court properly construed this court's remand order in prior appeal; claim that trial court erred by failing to make factual finding as to parties' intent regarding whether certain article of separation agreement incorporated remedial aspects of statute (§ 46b-86 (b)); claim that trial court erred by exceeding scope of remand order in prior appeal when it made unnecessary and binding factual findings concerning article of separation agreement not at issue.</i></p>	<p>282</p>

500 North Avenue, LLC v. Planning Commission . . . . .	115
<i>Zoning appeal; whether Superior Court improperly concluded that there was substantial evidence in record to support planning commission's finding that plaintiff's proposed lot line adjustment of two adjacent lots constituted subdivision under statute (§ 8-18); claim that Superior Court improperly concluded that subdivision approval was required because proposed lot line revision was more than minor adjustment; claim that because plaintiff's proposed boundary line revision would create third part, it required subdivision approval.</i>	
Flood v. Flood . . . . .	67
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motions for modification of child support; whether trial court's finding that there had been substantial change in defendant's financial circumstances was clearly erroneous; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining amount of defendant's child support obligation; claim that trial court erred by failing to consider and rule on defendant's motion for modification of child support obligation.</i>	
Godbout v. Attanasio . . . . .	88
<i>Official misconduct pursuant to statute (§ 12-170); motor vehicle tax assessment; claim that trial court improperly granted motion to dismiss on ground that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction because plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies; claim that motion to dismiss was improper procedural vehicle to challenge legal sufficiency of complaint; claim that trial court improperly determined that the complaint was insufficiently pleaded.</i>	
Kovachich v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services . . . . .	332
<i>Employment discrimination; retaliation; mootness; claim that trial court improperly admitted into evidence settlement communications between parties and relied on those communications in finding defendant liable for violation of Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act (§ 46a-51 et seq.); claim that trial court improperly precluded admission of plaintiff's deposition responses that had been amended by errata sheet; claim that trial court erred in concluding that all statements made by defendant's employees were admissible as statements made by party opponent.</i>	
Labissoniere v. Gaylord Hospital, Inc. . . . .	265
<i>Medical malpractice; motion to dismiss; personal jurisdiction; subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over defendant that was not legal entity when patient was treated; whether opinion letter authored by physician and general surgeon was by "similar health care provider" as defined by statute (§ 52-184c) when defendant physicians were board certified in internal medicine.</i>	
Mendes v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act . . . . .	25
<i>Unemployment compensation; appeal from decision of Board of Review of Employment Security Appeals Division affirming decision finding plaintiff ineligible for certain unemployment benefits; motion to open; claim that trial court exceeded scope of its authority by assessing factual findings of appeals referee as adopted by board; whether plaintiff was required to file motion to correct board's factual findings pursuant to rule of practice (§ 22-4).</i>	
Norwalk Medical Group, P.C. v. Yee . . . . .	208
<i>Arbitration; application to vacate arbitration award; application to confirm arbitration award; claim that arbitration award was not mutual, final and definite due to failure of arbitrator to allocate arbitration costs, expenses and compensation and to set forth reasoned award with respect to attorney's fees.</i>	
State v. Coleman. . . . .	172
<i>Assault in first degree; robbery in first degree; criminal possession of firearm; whether state's three year delay in filing charges violated defendant's right to due process; claim that right to speedy trial under sixth amendment and right under Interstate Agreement on Detainers (§ 54-186 et seq.) to final disposition of case within 180 days from date on which defendant requested speedy disposition were violated; claim that three year delay caused defendant actual substantial prejudice and was unreasonable and unjustifiable; claim that state deliberately delayed arrest to gain tactical advantage; waiver of claims stemming from postarrest delay.</i>	
State v. Ingala . . . . .	240
<i>Motion to suppress; whether trial court properly concluded that search was lawful under exigent circumstances exception to warrant requirement; whether trial court properly denied defendant's motion to suppress.</i>	

State v. Lopez . . . . .	56
<i>Attempt to commit robbery in first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; claim that trial court improperly admitted uncharged misconduct evidence; harmless error.</i>	
State v. Mayo . . . . .	166
<i>Breach of peace in second degree; whether evidence was sufficient to support defendant's conviction.</i>	
State v. Orr . . . . .	427
<i>Violation of probation; whether claim that evidence was insufficient for trial court to find that defendant violated his probation was moot; unpreserved claim that state violated rule of Brady v. Maryland (373 U.S. 83) by failing to disclose photographs of scene of drug crimes that led to violation of probation charge; unpreserved claim that defendant was denied due process and fair trial because state failed to adhere to trial court's order to file motion to proceed with probation violation case before it tried drug charges; claim that defendant was denied constitutional right to notice of charges against him; unpreserved claim that defendant's rights were violated as result of state's failure to file bill of particulars; unpreserved claim that trial court's comments violated rule (2.10 (a)) of Code of Judicial Conduct applicable to public statements by judge; unpreserved claim that trial court abused its discretion when it granted state's motion to open violation of probation case to present evidence of drug charges.</i>	
State v. Romero . . . . .	39
<i>Violation of probation; claim that trial court improperly declined to apply exclusionary rule pursuant to article first, § 7, of Connecticut constitution; whether warrantless search violated Connecticut constitution under certain condition of defendant's probation; whether defendant could reasonably be subjected to search of residence and possessions when probation officer had reasonable suspicion that defendant was violating conditions of probation.</i>	
State v. Sumler . . . . .	187
<i>Murder; conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; carrying pistol without permit; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; motion in limine; motion to suppress; unpreserved claim that trial judge violated defendant's constitutional right to due process by improperly failing to recuse himself from presiding over defendant's trial because he previously had signed search and seizure and arrest warrants against defendant; whether defendant could prevail pursuant to State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233); whether trial judge's failure to recuse himself constituted plain error; claim that trial court abused its discretion in admitting witness' testimony identifying defendant in surveillance video; whether witness' testimony constituted opinion on ultimate issue for jury; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress certain statements defendant made to police officer; whether police officer's conversation with defendant constituted custodial interrogation for purposes of Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436).</i>	
Stephen S. v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	230
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in rendering judgment declining to issue writ of habeas corpus; whether habeas petition was wholly frivolous on its face within meaning of applicable rule of practice (§ 23-24 (a) (2)); claim that habeas petition raised claims not raised in petitioner's two previous habeas petitions.</i>	
Whistnant v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	406
<i>Habeas corpus; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; reviewability of claim that habeas court improperly failed to conduct hearing before declining to issue writ of habeas corpus pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-24 (a) (1)); claim that habeas court improperly concluded that it lacked subject matter over claims in petition for writ of habeas corpus that retroactive application of 2013 amendment to parole eligibility statute (§ 54-125a (b) (2)) to petitioner violated ex post facto clause of federal constitution and petitioner's right to due process.</i>	