

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 207

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Belevich v. Renaissance I, LLC</i> <i>Negligence; premises liability; summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motion for summary judgment on basis of ongoing storm doctrine; whether defendants met initial burden to demonstrate no genuine issue of material fact that there was ongoing storm at time of plaintiff's fall; whether plaintiffs met burden to demonstrate existence of genuine issue of fact as to whether fall was caused by slippery condition that existed prior to ongoing storm and whether defendants had actual or constructive notice of allegedly preexisting condition; adoption of state of New York burden-shifting approach under ongoing storm doctrine.</i> | 119 |
| <i>Coleman v. Bembridge</i> <i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly modified physical custody of parties' minor child prospectively; claim that trial court acted beyond its statutory authority and violated plaintiff's due process rights to extent that it awarded parties joint physical custody of child; claim that trial court abused its discretion by entering physical custody orders that were predicated on inconsistent factual findings, were incompatible with trial court's legal custody orders, and were not in child's best interest.</i> | 28 |
| <i>De Almeida-Kennedy v. Kennedy</i> <i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court lacked proper basis on which to grant plaintiff's motion to dismiss; claim that trial court abused its discretion in staying enforcement of emergency ex parte custody order; claim that trial court improperly concluded that it did not have exclusive, continuing jurisdiction under applicable statute (§ 46b-115l (a) (1)); claim that trial court improperly dismissed certain of defendant's motions unrelated to issues of child custody or visitation; claim that trial court abused its discretion in deferring consideration of defendant's motion to modify his alimony, child support and visitation orders.</i> | 244 |
| <i>Finney v. Commissioner of Correction</i> <i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to rule of practice (§ 23-29 (2)); whether habeas petition stated claim on which habeas relief could be granted; whether habeas court improperly determined that habeas petition was timely filed within limitation period set forth in applicable statute (§ 52-470 (c)).</i> | 133 |
| <i>In re Karter F.</i> <i>Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court improperly found that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify respondent father with minor child; whether trial court properly found that father was unable or unwilling to benefit from reunification efforts; claim that trial court improperly found that father failed to rehabilitate pursuant to applicable statute (§ 17a-112 (j) (3) (B) (i)); whether trial court failed to consider impact of COVID-19 pandemic and cessation of services while father was incarcerated in determining that father failed to rehabilitate; claim that trial court improperly found that termination of father's parental rights was in minor child's best interests.</i> | 1 |
| <i>Leconte v. Commissioner of Correction</i> <i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner's trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to investigate adequately and to present evidence that petitioner suffered from significant mental disease; claim that evidence regarding petitioner's mental health was necessary to effectively cross-examine and to discredit state's witnesses regarding his inculpatory statement to cellmate; claim that habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner did not demonstrate that his appellate counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to raise on direct appeal claim that trial court improperly granted state's motion for joinder of robbery cases.</i> | 306 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Malinowski v. Sikorsky Aircraft Corp. | 266 |
| <i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed Workers' Compensation Commissioner's award to plaintiff; claim that expert opinion was not expressed with reasonable degree of medical probability; claim that commissioner's causation finding was not supported by competent medical evidence; claim that commissioner improperly referred to plaintiff's work activities beyond those referenced in medical records; whether board properly affirmed commissioner's denial of defendants' motion for articulation.</i> | |
| Noroton Heights Shopping Center, Inc. v. Phil's Grill, LLC | 211 |
| <i>Summary process; whether trial court's finding that defendant breached lease by violating terms of relocation clause was clearly erroneous; whether existence of substitute premises was condition precedent to plaintiff lessor's right to issue note of substitution to defendant lessee.</i> | |
| Stafford v. Commissioner of Correction | 85 |
| <i>Habeas corpus; subject matter jurisdiction; whether petitioner's appeal was rendered moot following concession by respondent Commissioner of Correction that petitioner is eligible for parole; whether habeas court improperly dismissed petition on basis of testimony that Board of Pardons and Paroles found petitioner to be eligible for parole; claim that the habeas court improperly concluded that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over claims in petition for writ of habeas corpus that retroactive application of parole eligibility statute (§ 54-125a (b) (1)) to petitioner violated ex post facto clause of federal constitution.</i> | |
| State v. Dionne. | 106 |
| <i>Sexual assault in fourth degree; risk of injury to child; plain error doctrine; claim that trial court erred in allowing constancy of accusation testimony by victim's mother; claim that trial court erred by admitting videotape of forensic interview of victim under constancy of accusation doctrine or pursuant to medical diagnosis or treatment exception to rule against hearsay evidence.</i> | |
| State v. Glen S. | 56 |
| <i>Violation of probation; whether trial court's canvass of defendant regarding waiver of his right to be represented by counsel was constitutionally inadequate under Faretta v. California (422 U.S. 806); whether defendant's alleged noticeable impairment during his violation of probation evidentiary hearing entitled him to new trial under State v. Connor (292 Conn. 483); whether this court should have exercised its supervisory authority to require trial courts to canvass criminal defendants about waiver of their constitutional rights to testify; whether defendant was deprived of his constitutional right to conflict free representation.</i> | |
| State v. Heriberto B. | 192 |
| <i>Risk of injury to child; whether trial court properly dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction first motion to correct illegal sentence defendant filed as self-represented party; reviewability of unreserved constitutional claim of violation of right to jury trial.</i> | |
| State v. Paschal | 328 |
| <i>Attempt to commit assault of public safety personnel; whether trial court deprived defendant of his right to self-representation; whether trial court abused its discretion by admitting evidence of defendant's prior uncharged misconduct.</i> | |
| State v. Small | 349 |
| <i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; whether trial court erred in denying defendant's request for appointment of counsel pursuant to State v. Francis (322 Conn. 247) to represent him on motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that defendant's right to counsel was violated because public defender did not consult with him regarding motion to correct illegal sentence or inform him or trial court of reasons underlying public defender's conclusion that no sound basis existed for motion.</i> | |
| State v. Stephenson | 154 |
| <i>Burglary in third degree; attempt to commit tampering with physical evidence; attempt to commit arson in second degree; claim that evidence was insufficient to support conviction of charged offenses; whether trial court's improper exclusion of evidence of defendant's mental state was harmless beyond reasonable doubt; claim that trial court's improper evidentiary ruling substantially affected jury's verdict and deprived defendant of constitutional rights to present defense.</i> | |
| Wright v. Dzurenda | 228 |
| <i>Declaratory judgment; motion to dismiss; exhaustion of administrative remedies pursuant to federal statute (§ 42 U.S.C. § 1997e (a)); order of pleadings pursuant to relevant rule of practice (§ 10-60); claim that trial court erred in determining</i> | |

that plaintiff had failed to exhaust his administrative remedies; claim that trial court erred in considering defendant's special defense that plaintiff had failed to exhaust his administrative remedies because defendant had waived that defense.