

**Cumulative Table of Cases**  
**Connecticut Appellate Reports**  
**Volume 203**

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

Allan v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	903
Anderson v. Bloomfield. . . . .	182
<i>Contracts; third-party beneficiary; motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly determined that plaintiff lacked standing because she was not third-party beneficiary of contract.</i>	
Bank of New York Mellon v. Madison . . . . .	8
<i>Foreclosure; motion for judgment; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted plaintiff's oral motion for judgment on its reformation of mortgage claim; whether trial court improperly granted plaintiff's motion for summary judgment as to liability on its foreclosure claim; claim that plaintiff failed to establish that default notice that it had mailed to defendants complied with notice requirements of mortgage.</i>	
Batista v. Cortes . . . . .	365
<i>Child custody; motion for modification of custody; claim that trial court abused its discretion in concluding that it was in child's best interests for child to reside with mother; whether trial court failed to properly consider claim of child support overpayment.</i>	
Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC v. MaCrae-Gray (Memorandum Decision). . . . .	903
Berman v. Berman. . . . .	300
<i>Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment modification of alimony; whether trial court improperly found that defendant had relinquished claims she might have had to certain marital assets in exchange for lifetime alimony; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for modification of alimony on basis of erroneous finding.</i>	
Bouffard v. Lewis . . . . .	116
<i>Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment modification of alimony and child support; motion for contempt; whether automatic stay pursuant to rule of practice (§ 61-11 (c)) was applicable; whether trial court's imposition of automatic stay on orders to make payments of alimony and child support in connection with judgment finding party in contempt was improper.</i>	
Boutillier v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision). . . . .	901
Brown v. Cartwright . . . . .	490
<i>Product liability; motion to set aside verdict and for new trial; whether trial court erred in denying motion to set aside verdict and for new trial; claim that delay in delivering plaintiff's exhibits to jury constituted harmful evidentiary impropriety; claim that, in returning verdict mere minutes after receiving plaintiff's exhibits, jury could not have followed court's instructions in full, resulting in juror misconduct; claim that defendants' counsel unfairly prejudiced jury by reading from documents not in evidence.</i>	
Buie v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	232
<i>Habeas corpus; mootness; claim that habeas court improperly determined that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over habeas petition and denied petition for certification to appeal; whether this court could afford petitioner practical relief.</i>	
C & H Shoreline, LLC v. Rubino. . . . .	351
<i>Breach of contract; whether trial court properly rendered judgment for defendants on basis that plaintiff's claims were contractually time barred; whether contractual limitation period was ambiguous as to whether term "claiming party" referred only to client or to any party asserting cause of action relating to agreement; application of contra proferentem rule to resolve ambiguity in agreement against drafter.</i>	
Carroll v. Yankwitt . . . . .	449
<i>Landlord-tenant; action for return of security deposit; whether trial court improperly adopted recommendations of attorney trial referee and rendered judgment thereon; whether e-mail that stated items of damage to leased property complied with security deposit statute ([Rev. to 2013] § 47a-21 (d) (2)) by sufficiently</i>	

	<i>apprising plaintiff of items of damage; whether attorney trial referee improperly concluded that defendant violated Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.) on ground that written statement of damages failed to satisfy requirements of (Rev. to 2013) § 47a-21 (d) (2); whether trial court improperly determined that defendant violated CUTPA on ground that statement of damages was pretextual; claim that attorney trial referee's finding that defendant was not entitled to damages on count of counterclaim alleging certain property damage was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court improperly adopted attorney trial referee's finding that defendant was not entitled to damages for one week of unpaid rent under first lease; claim that trial court improperly failed to award plaintiff full amount of attorney's fee request under CUTPA; claim that trial court improperly failed to rule on plaintiff's request for punitive damages under CUTPA.</i>	
Carten v. Carten . . . . .	<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court erred in not making award of alimony to defendant.</i>	598
Derblom v. Archdiocese of Hartford . . . . .	<i>Motion to dismiss; standing; constructive trust; whether trial court properly granted defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of standing; whether trial court erred in construing bequest as outright gift rather than charitable trust; whether trial court erred in concluding that special interest exception to rule that attorney general has exclusive authority to bring action to enforce charitable gifts is limited to actions involving charitable trusts.</i>	197
Disciplinary Counsel v. Cannatelli . . . . .	<i>Attorney misconduct; presentment; appeal from judgment of trial court suspending respondent attorney from practice of law; claim that trial court erred in denying respondent's postjudgment motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that trial court lacked jurisdiction because hearing on respondent's presentment was not held within sixty days of filing thereof, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 2-47 (a)).</i>	236
Donald G. v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	<i>Habeas corpus; whether trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to question witnesses about petitioner's attendance at event where some of his alleged criminal conduct occurred; whether petitioner was prejudiced by trial counsel's reference to complainant as victim or by trial counsel's failure to object or to request curative instruction when state made same reference; whether trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to investigate claim of uncharged misconduct.</i>	58
Estate of James E. Fry v. Lobbuzzo (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .		901
Houghtaling v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance during litigation of motion to suppress evidence at criminal trial; whether trial counsel's failure to call witness at hearing on motion to suppress fell below objective standard of reasonableness; claim that trial counsel rendered deficient performance by relying on Baker v. Carr (369 U.S. 186), rather than Katz v. United States (389 U.S. 347), in memorandum in support of motion to suppress; claim that habeas court deprived petitioner of state and federal constitutional rights to due process of law by analyzing, in its memorandum of decision, exhibit that had been admitted as full exhibit at habeas trial as exhibit admitted only for limited purpose; whether habeas court erroneously excluded certain evidence.</i>	246
Jacques v. Commissioner of Energy & Environmental Protection . . . . .	<i>Administrative appeal; injunction; motion to dismiss; whether trial court erred in determining that plaintiff failed to allege facts sufficient to establish standing under applicable statute (§ 22a-16); whether trial court applied proper rule of law when construing factual allegations in complaint; whether trial court erred in determining that allegations of complaint did not come within exception to sovereign immunity for alleged violations of constitutional rights; whether trial court erred in holding that allegations of complaint did not come within exception to sovereign immunity for substantial allegation of wrongful conduct to promote illegal purpose in excess of state officer's statutory authority; whether trial court erred when it ruled that scoping process/review of environmental impact evaluation was not proceeding for purposes of intervention under applicable statute (§ 22a-19).</i>	419

Johnson v. Johnson . . . . . 405  
*Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court committed plain error by imposing its own findings and interpretation of parties' separation agreement; claim that trial court acted in manner that gave rise to appearance of lack of impartiality; claim that trial court abused its discretion when it issued contradictory findings without changing its modified orders and issued orders that were beyond statutory time frame that defendant did not identify in brief; claim that trial court abused its discretion in finding defendant in contempt.*

Lindquist v. Freedom of Information Commission . . . . . 512  
*Administrative appeal; Freedom of Information Act (§ 1-200 et seq.); whether trial court properly concluded that Freedom of Information Commission did not abuse its discretion in finding that redacted records were exempt from disclosure under statute (§ 1-210 (b) (1)); whether trial court abused its discretion when it dismissed plaintiff's appeal, concluding that commission had correctly applied § 1-210 (e) (1) to final comments and ratings at issue; whether final version of comments and ratings served as recommendations for purpose of dean's review of faculty member's rating.*

Mecca v. Mecca . . . . . 541  
*Dissolution of marriage; motion to open; claim that trial court applied incorrect legal standard with respect to defendant's motion to open; whether trial court assigned duty of due diligence to defendant; whether trial court abused its discretion in finding that there was no fraud on part of plaintiff; claim that trial court abused its discretion by failing to consider pattern of fraudulent conduct on part of plaintiff.*

M. S. v. P. S. . . . . 377  
*Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court abused its discretion in fashioning support orders that totaled approximately 90 percent of defendant's net weekly income; whether trial court abused its discretion in entering relocation order allowing plaintiff to move across state lines within thirty-five miles of her current residence; whether trial court abused its discretion in amount of attorney's fees pendente lite it awarded to plaintiff.*

Osbourne v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . . 902

Pascola-Milton v. Millard . . . . . 172  
*Negligence; underinsured motorist benefits; arbitration; motion for summary judgment; whether trial court erred in denying plaintiff's demand for trial de novo following voluntary arbitration; whether plaintiff's claims were barred by two year statute of limitations (§ 52-584).*

Ricketts v. Ricketts . . . . . 1  
*Dissolution of marriage; jurisdiction; whether appeal from postdissolution orders of trial court denying plaintiff's motion to transfer matter to Regional Family Trial Docket and appointing guardian ad litem for parties' minor children was from final judgment.*

St. Pierre v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision) . . . . . 901

Sieranski v. TJC Esq, A Professional Services Corp. . . . . 75  
*Wrongful termination of employment; motion to strike; whether plaintiff sufficiently pleaded facts that, if proven, would fall under public policy exception to at-will employment doctrine; whether statutes (§§ 3-94h and 53a-157b) relied on by plaintiff outline public policy against knowingly assisting affiant in submitting false statements to court; whether notary's act of notarizing affidavit that she believed to be false would violate § 3-94h, which prohibits notaries from performing any action with intent to deceive or defraud.*

Solek v. Commissioner of Correction. . . . . 289  
*Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court improperly determined that petitioner had not established good cause for untimely filing sufficient to rebut statutory (§ 52-470) presumption of unwarranted delay; reviewability on appeal of claim raised for first time in petitioner's reply brief; whether petitioner demonstrated that habeas court's conclusion that he had not demonstrated good cause for delay was debatable among jurists of reason, court could resolve issue differently or questions raised deserved encouragement to proceed further; whether record was adequate to review claim that petitioner's severe mental health issues provided good cause for delay; whether habeas court failed to provide petitioner with meaningful opportunity to investigate and to present evidence as to good cause for delay in filing petition.*

South Windsor v. Lanata . . . . .	89
<i>Zoning; claim that cease and desist order premised on alleged zoning violation was unconstitutionally vague; whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering fines during period in which defendant was under orders not to disturb property; claim that trial court improperly assessed fines for wilful violation of zoning regulations pursuant to statute (§ 8-12).</i>	
Starke v. Goodwin Estate Assn., Inc. . . . .	607
<i>Common Interest Ownership Act (§ 47-200 et seq.); mootness; claim that trial court improperly dismissed complaint as moot because plaintiff's claim for damages included damages to personal property that was not contingent on his continued ownership of condominium unit.</i>	
State v. Capasso . . . . .	333
<i>Reckless burning; false reporting of incident in second degree; sufficiency of evidence; whether state was required to prove that building in danger of destruction or damage referenced in reckless burning statute (§ 53a-114) was owned exclusively by someone other than defendant; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's motion to set aside verdict on ground that conviction for reckless burning was against weight of evidence.</i>	
State v. Geanuracos . . . . .	359
<i>Burglary in third degree; larceny in third degree; sufficiency of evidence; whether evidence adduced at trial was sufficient to find that defendant had entered or remained in victim's home unlawfully.</i>	
State v. Gordon (See State v. Lyons) . . . . .	551
State v. Greene-Walters (See State v. Lyons) . . . . .	551
State v. Lyons . . . . .	551
<i>Possession of controlled substance; sale of controlled substance; possession of drug paraphernalia; possession of controlled substance within 1500 feet of school; possession of drug paraphernalia within 1500 feet of school; operation of drug factory; theft of firearm; negligent storage of firearm; motion to suppress; claim that trial court erred in determining that defendant met his burden of proving expectation of privacy in area searched by law enforcement officers and in determining that defendant had standing to proceed with motion to suppress; claim that trial court erred in granting motion to suppress.</i>	
State v. Hall-George . . . . .	219
<i>Robbery in second degree; whether evidence was sufficient to prove beyond reasonable doubt that defendant threatened use of what he represented by his words or conduct to be deadly weapon or dangerous instrument pursuant to statute (§ 53a-135 (a) (1) (B)).</i>	
State v. Russaw . . . . .	123
<i>Manlaughter in second degree; evading responsibility; motion to suppress; whether trial court properly denied motion to suppress statements defendant made to police during custodial interrogation after defendant was not readvised of his Miranda rights before starting new line of questioning; whether interrogation of defendant on multiple subject matters comprised one continuous interview; whether Miranda rights are offense specific; whether waiver of Miranda rights was voluntary; whether admission of statements into evidence, if assumed to be improper, would have resulted in harmless error.</i>	
Stephenson v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	314
<i>Habeas corpus; subject matter jurisdiction; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether petitioner sufficiently alleged claim under stigma plus test; whether claim of misapplication of parole eligibility statute (§ 54-125a) gave rise to cognizable liberty interest sufficient to invoke subject matter jurisdiction of habeas court.</i>	
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Doe . . . . .	218
<i>Summary process; whether appeal was moot following defendants' dispossession of property.</i>	
U.S. Bank, N.A. v. Hickey (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .	902
U.S. Bank, National Assn. v. Moncho . . . . .	28
<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court erred in determining that defendants were not entitled to implied admissions on special defenses; claim that plaintiff was not proper owner of debt and therefore lacked standing; whether trial court erred in rejecting statute of limitations special defense for lack of ripeness; whether noncompliance with securitization requirements implicated plaintiff's standing; whether defendants received proper notice of default and acceleration prior to foreclosure; whether trial court abused its discretion in rejecting defendants' special defense</i>	

*of unclean hands; whether trial court erred in admitting payment history on note into evidence under business records exception to hearsay rule.*

Velez v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . . 141  
*Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in dismissing, pursuant to statute (§ 52-470 (e)), successive petition for writ of habeas corpus for failure to show good cause for delay in filing petition beyond deadline for successive petitions set forth in § 52-470 (d) (2); claim that habeas court improperly determined that petitioner failed to prove that his mental deficiencies, as described in 2005 neuropsychological report, contributed to his delay in filing second habeas petition and, thus, failed to rebut presumption of unreasonable delay set forth in § 52-470 (d).*

Village Mortgage Co. v. Veneziano . . . . . 154  
*Declaratory judgment; mootness; motion to dismiss; jurisdiction; claim that trial court erred in its interpretation of parties' stipulation; whether defendant's appellate claims were moot; whether defendant could be afforded practical relief on appeal; whether outcome of appeal had collateral estoppel and res judicata effects as to when plaintiff acquired defendant's stock; whether defendant's ability to bring action for vexatious litigation or fraud in future against plaintiff was dependent on appeal being heard on its merits.*

Vossbrinck v. Accredited Home Lenders, Inc. (Memorandum Decision). . . . . 902  
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Robertson (Memorandum Decision). . . . . 903