

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 206

<p><i>Boyajian v. Planning & Zoning Commission</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Zoning; whether plaintiffs' failure to appeal from decision of zoning board of appeals that granted application for variance rendered their opposition to planning and zoning commission's decision to grant special permit to same individual based on variance impermissible collateral attack on validity of variance.</i></p>	118
<p><i>Bray v. Bray</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motion for contempt; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that meaning of term "net," as used in parties' separation agreement, was clear and unambiguous; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that separation agreement did not contemplate consideration of defendant's net income to calculate amount of his bonus and stock income that was subject to distribution to plaintiff.</i></p>	46
<p><i>Cruz v. Commissioner of Correction</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court erred in concluding that counsel's allegedly deficient representation during plea negotiations was not prejudicial; whether habeas court erred in determining that petitioner failed to prove his claim of ineffective assistance with respect to his counsel's representation during his sentencing proceedings; claim that petitioner was entitled to presumption of prejudice pursuant to United States v. Cronin (466 U.S. 648) and Davis v. Commissioner of Correction (319 Conn. 548) with respect to his ineffective assistance of counsel claim.</i></p>	17
<p><i>Monts v. Board of Education</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Disability discrimination; claim that trial court erred by failing to charge jury on plaintiff's claim of interference with Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. § 2601 et seq.); claim that trial court erred by admitting letter prepared by plaintiff's coworker into evidence under business records exception to hearsay rule; claim that trial court erred by refusing to admit into evidence certain medical records of plaintiff.</i></p>	106
<p><i>Onthank v. Onthank.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Breach of contract; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff substantially complied with notice of default provision of promissory note; claim that trial court erred in its calculation of damages awarded to plaintiff.</i></p>	54
<p><i>Saunders v. KDFBS, LLC</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Foreclosure; judgment of foreclosure by sale; whether trial court erred in determining plaintiff's mortgage had priority over defendant's mortgage; claim that plaintiff had constructive notice of defendant's mortgage; constructive notice doctrine, discussed.</i></p>	92
<p><i>State v. Gordon</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Larceny of elderly person by embezzlement in second degree; claim that trial court improperly admitted into evidence testimonial hearsay statement of victim in violation of defendant's constitutional right to confrontation; claim that defendant was deprived of due process rights when prosecutor engaged in prosecutorial impropriety by making substantive use of testimonial hearsay statement in closing rebuttal argument; whether witness' testimony regarding victim's statement constituted hearsay; whether defendant was harmed by admission of witness' testimony regarding victim's statement; whether this court needed to reach merits of defendant's prosecutorial impropriety claim.</i></p>	70
<p><i>State v. Lane</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Assault in first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to disqualify trial judge; claim that this court should revisit precedent set by State v. Milner (325 Conn. 1) and require recusal of judicial authority when there is appearance of partiality, in absence of actual partiality; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting photographs of victim's injuries into evidence; claim that photographs of victim's injuries were irrelevant and unduly prejudicial.</i></p>	1

Villanueva v. Villanueva. 36
Breach of contract; implied in fact contract; damages; statute of limitations; whether trial court erred in finding implied partnership agreement between parties; whether trial court erred in concluding that plaintiff provided credible evidence of his damages; whether trial court improperly rejected defendant's special defense that plaintiff's action was barred by three year statute of limitations (§ 52-577).