

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 201

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Anderson v. Commissioner of Correction	1
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance to petitioner in failing to present evidence in support of petitioner's claim of self-defense; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petitioner's petition for certification to appeal.</i>	
Bank of New York Mellon v. Mercier (Memorandum Decision).	903
Bevilacqua v. Bevilacqua	261
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's request for continuance of trial; whether trial court erred by ordering defendant to pay periodic alimony to plaintiff; whether trial court erred by awarding certain real property to defendant.</i>	
Brown v. State (Memorandum Decision).	903
Campbell v. Shiloh Baptist Church (Memorandum Decision)	902
Commissioner of Labor v. Walnut Tire Shop, LLC	492
<i>Wage collection statute (§ 31-72); motion for default; motion to open judgment of default; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying defendants' motion to open.</i>	
Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction	254
<i>Habeas corpus; claim of ineffective assistance of counsel; claim that habeas court incorrectly concluded that trial counsel's failure to file motion to dismiss home invasion charge, to which petitioner had pleaded guilty pursuant to North Carolina v. Alford (400 U.S. 25), did not constitute ineffective assistance; whether petitioner failed to demonstrate that he was prejudiced by trial counsel's alleged deficient performance.</i>	
Doe v. Flanigan	411
<i>Negligence; motion for summary judgment; whether genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether defendant city's employee engaged in negligent or wilful misconduct; whether genuine issue of material fact existed that defendant city's employee was acting within scope of employment; whether trial court erred in rendering summary judgment for defendant on basis of arguments not raised in defendant's motion.</i>	
Gershon v. Back	276
<i>Dissolution of marriage; subject matter jurisdiction; motion to open foreign dissolution judgment; claim that trial court improperly dismissed motion to open for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court properly determined that plaintiff was required to bring plenary action to vacate parties' stipulation; improper form of judgment.</i>	
In re D'Andre T.	396
<i>Termination of parental rights; jurisdiction; supervisory authority over administration of justice; whether trial court denied respondent fundamentally fair proceeding by treating her motion to transfer guardianship with less regard than petitions to terminate her parental rights; claim that this court should exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to require Superior Court to make certain written findings in all cases in which court considers transfer of guardianship motion and petition to terminate parental rights concurrently; claim that this court lacked jurisdiction over appeal because respondent's request for new procedural rule was not tethered to any actual controversy and respondent did not claim that trial court erred in its decisions on termination petitions or motion to transfer guardianship.</i>	
In re Madison C.	184
<i>Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court deprived respondent of substantive due process rights under United States constitution; whether record was adequate to review respondent's unreserved constitutional claim under first prong of State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233).</i>	

In re Xavier H.	81
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court made clearly erroneous subordinate factual findings and applied such findings in reaching its decision that there was sufficient evidence to terminate respondent father's parental rights; whether trial court employed proper standard in finding that respondent parents had each failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage belief that within reasonable time they could assume responsible positions in life of child; whether trial court employed proper standard in finding that termination of respondent father's parental rights was in child's best interest; whether trial court erred in finding that respondent mother had failed to rehabilitate; whether trial court failed to make complete written findings that termination of respondent mother's parental rights was in child's best interest, as required by statute (§ 17a-112 (k)).</i>	
Leonova v. Leonov	285
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion for attorney's fees; whether trial court abused its discretion by improperly basing supplemental alimony awarded to plaintiff on defendant's gross, rather than net, bonus income; whether trial court acted in excess of statutory authority by ordering parties to establish and to contribute to educational savings plans; whether trial court erred in finding defendant in contempt for violating automatic orders in effect, pursuant to relevant rule of practice (§ 25-5), by renting seasonal ski lodge; whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering defendant to reimburse plaintiff for one half of cost defendant incurred in renting ski lodge and to reimburse plaintiff for one half of loss that he incurred as result of cryptocurrency investment he made after imposition of automatic orders; whether trial court has authority to compensate spouse for losses caused by violation of automatic orders by adjusting distribution of marital assets in injured spouse's favor; whether trial court abused its discretion by failing to attribute earning capacity to plaintiff in determining alimony and child support; whether trial court erred in awarding plaintiff attorney's fees.</i>	
Nationstar Mortgage, LLC v. Gabriel	39
<i>Summary process; return of service; whether trial court properly denied motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that notice to quit was not served on all designated occupants of property, as required by statute (§ 47a-23); whether trial court erred in denying defendants' request for evidentiary hearing despite having raised disputed issue of fact; claim that absence of evidentiary hearing led to clearly erroneous findings by trial court.</i>	
Northwest Hills Chrysler Jeep, LLC v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles.	128
<i>Administrative appeal; claim that trial court improperly dismissed appeal from decision of Department of Motor Vehicles finding that good cause existed, pursuant to statute (§ 42-133dd (c)), to establish new automobile dealership within relevant market area of plaintiffs; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.</i>	
Osborne-Perrault v. Twin Oaks Condominium Assn. (Memorandum Decision)	904
Panaroni v. Doody (Memorandum Decision)	902
Stanley v. Macchiarulo (Memorandum Decision)	902
State v. Anderson	21
<i>Assault in first degree with firearm; assault of peace officer with firearm; self-defense; claim that trial court improperly failed to instruct jury on self-defense.</i>	
State v. Bennett (Memorandum Decision)	901
State v. Buie (Memorandum Decision)	903
State v. Gaston.	225
<i>Murder; subject matter jurisdiction; standing; claim that trial court committed plain error pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 60-5) when it permitted witness to testify against defendant instead of accepting witness' invocation of fifth amendment right against self-incrimination.</i>	
State v. Hazard.	46
<i>Robbery in first degree; whether there was sufficient evidence from which jury reasonably could have found that defendant was person who robbed storage facility; claim that defendant proved affirmative defense of inoperability of gun used in robbery; whether trial court abused its discretion when it denied motion for mistrial based on claim that police officer gave testimony that constituted improper lay opinion under applicable provision of Connecticut Code of Evidence (§ 7-1) and improperly gave opinion on ultimate issue of identity in violation of applicable provision of Connecticut Code of Evidence (§ 7-3); claim that trial court erred in failing to give jury defendant's requested instruction on identity.</i>	

State v. Jones (Memorandum Decision)	901
State v. Knox	457
<i>Criminal possession of firearm; tampering with physical evidence; motion for judgment of acquittal; right to counsel; whether state presented sufficient evidence that defendant intended to impair availability of gun in subsequent police investigation; whether defendant made ambiguous request for counsel during police interview, requiring police to clarify request pursuant to State v. Purcell (331 Conn. 318); whether trial court abused its discretion in violation of applicable rule of evidence (§ 1-5) by admitting and excluding certain of defendant's statements made during police interview; whether trial court's evidentiary rulings violated defendant's rights to due process and to present defense.</i>	
State v. Lemanski	360
<i>Operating motor vehicle while under influence of intoxicating liquor; plain error doctrine; unreserved claim that defendant's constitutional right to confrontation was violated when trial court improperly admitted certain testimonial hearsay into evidence; unreserved claim that trial court improperly instructed jury regarding defendant's alleged refusal to submit to breath test.</i>	
State v. Parker	435
<i>Probation; whether trial court erred in revoking probation without first finding that defendant's failure to pay restitution was wilful; whether trial court applied correct legal standard in making implicit finding of wilfulness; whether trial court was required to make explicit findings on record as to whether defendant had ability to pay and, if so, whether failure to pay was wilful, and, if not, whether defendant made sufficient bona fide efforts legally to acquire resources to pay.</i>	
State v. Schimanski	164
<i>Operating motor vehicle while license was under suspension in violation of statute (§ 14-215); claim that trial court erred in denying motion to dismiss charge of operating motor vehicle while license was under suspension for violation of statute (§ 14-227b) where forty-five day suspension period referenced in § 14-227b had elapsed; claim that interpretation of statute (§ 14-227k) requiring installation of ignition interlock device violated equal protection clause of United States constitution by imposing undue burdens on indigent individuals; whether claim that trial court erred in denying motion to dismiss charge of operating motor vehicle not equipped with functioning ignition interlock device was justiciable.</i>	
State v. Sebben	376
<i>Reimbursement for costs of incarceration; summary judgment; claim that assessed cost of defendant's incarceration was based on unreliable calculation; claim that defendant's right to equal protection was violated because state had not sought reimbursement for incarceration costs from other inmates; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of relevant facts and applicable law on issues.</i>	
Turner v. Commissioner of Correction	196
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petitioner's petition for certification to appeal; claim that petitioner was deprived of fair trial because respondent elicited perjured testimony from petitioner's criminal trial counsel during first habeas trial; claim that state suppressed exculpatory evidence; claim that police department failed to preserve exculpatory evidence; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petitioner's postjudgment motion to open judgment and disqualify judicial authority.</i>	
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Brown (Memorandum Decision)	901
Wright v. Commissioner of Correction	339
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that petitioner's due process rights were violated when he was denied deportation parole eligibility hearing; whether petitioner had cognizable liberty interest in deportation parole eligibility or eligibility hearing.</i>	
Wright v. Giles	353
<i>Action pursuant to federal statute (42 U.S.C. § 1983) alleging deprivation of federal and state constitutional rights to due process; whether plaintiff was entitled to deportation parole eligibility hearing pursuant to statute (§ 54-125d); whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiff lacked standing.</i>	