

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 205

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Antonio A. v. Commissioner of Correction. 46
Habeas corpus; request for order to show cause pursuant to statute (§ 52-470 (d) and (e)); claim that habeas court erred in failing to afford petitioner's counsel reasonable opportunity to investigate cause of delay in filing second habeas petition; whether habeas court was obligated to delay its consideration of respondent's request for order to show cause because petitioner's counsel represented to court that it was possible that, in future, petitioner could pursue actual innocence claim in amended petition; whether habeas court abused its discretion in refusing to afford petitioner any additional time prior to acting on respondent's request for order to show cause; whether petitioner's counsel was on notice of purpose of hearing on respondent's request; claim that habeas court erred in denying petitioner's motion for reconsideration; whether habeas court abused its discretion in treating motion for reconsideration as motion to open judgment; claim that habeas court erred in denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that habeas court erred in denying motion for permission to file late amended petition for certification to appeal and for reconsideration of denial of petition for certification to appeal; claim that habeas court erred in dismissing petitioner's third habeas petition; whether habeas court's dismissal of third habeas petition under rule of practice (§ 23-29 (3)) during its preliminary consideration of petition and prior to issuing writ of habeas corpus was procedurally improper; whether proper remedy was for habeas court to issue writ and, following appointment of counsel, petitioner be given opportunity to rectify any pleading deficiencies.
Fairfield Shores, LLC v. DeSalvo 96
Landlord-tenant; alleged damages to rental property in excess of security deposit; whether appeal was moot on basis that defendants did not challenge all independent bases for trial court's judgment; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment for plaintiff on basis of statutory (§ 47a-2) exemption for certain housing arrangements incidental to educational services from application of title 47a of General Statutes to security deposit; whether judgment correctly was rendered for plaintiff on defendants' second amended counterclaim when defendants made certain judicial admission in joint stipulation of facts concerning security deposit.
Goshen Mortgage, LLC v. Androulidakis 15
Foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly determined that plaintiff had standing to commence foreclosure action; claim that trial court improperly granted motion to substitute plaintiff; claim that trial court improperly denied motions to dismiss; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to liability; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment of strict foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to open judgment.
Marco v. Starr Indemnity & Liability Co. 111
Breach of contract; duty to defend; law of case doctrine; claim that trial court erred in ordering court trial on matter of insurer's duty to defend following denial of summary judgment on same issue; claim that trial court improperly deprived plaintiff of right to jury trial on duty to defend issue; claim that trial judge should have recused himself to avoid appearance of impropriety due to his involvement in pretrial settlement negotiations.
Ortiz v. Torres-Rodriguez. 129
Termination of employment; recklessness; intentional infliction of emotional distress; libel; whether trial court properly granted defendant's motion for summary judgment; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of relevant facts, issues and applicable law.
State v. Coltherst 1
Motion to correct illegal sentence; whether trial court properly dismissed motion to correct illegal sentence; whether defendant was entitled to resentencing because trial court imposed effective life sentence without having first considered defend-

ant's age and hallmark characteristics of youth; claim that sentencing proceeding was merely academic exercise that contravened intent of legislature in eliminating availability of capital felony for juvenile defendants; claim that State v. Delgado (323 Conn. 801) was inapplicable because it could be presumed that sentencing court knew defendant previously had been sentenced to life imprisonment without possibility of release.