

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 202

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

A & R Enterprises, LLC v. Sentinel Ins. Co., Ltd.	224
<i>Insurance; alleged breach of commercial automobile insurance policy; reviewability of claim that trial court erred in concluding that recovery of full cost of repairs to insured's vehicle was precluded by insured's failure to comply with voluntary payment provision of insurance policy issued by defendant; claim that trial court erred in concluding that defendant's reliance on insured's alleged noncompliance with voluntary payment provision of policy did not constitute improper attempt to steer insured to defendant's preferred auto repair shop in violation of applicable statute (§ 38a-354 (b)).</i>	
Bank of America, National Assn. v. Sorrentino (Memorandum Decision)	903
Collibee v. Bitteker (Memorandum Decision)	901
Figueroa v. Commissioner of Correction.	54
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance in failing to request alibi instruction; claim that appellate counsel rendered ineffective assistance in failing to raise claim that petitioner's sixth amendment right to trial by jury was violated; whether habeas court properly dismissed petitioner's claim that his constitutional right to trial by jury was violated because it was procedurally defaulted.</i>	
Gould v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	901
In re Josiah D.	234
<i>Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court committed reversible error by failing to notify respondent father that it would be drawing adverse inference from his decision not to testify; request for this court to exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to require notice to parent beyond what is required by rule of practice (§ 35a-7A).</i>	
In re November H.	106
<i>Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court's finding that respondent father lacked normal and healthy parent-child bond with his child was internally inconsistent with finding that there was no parent-child relationship; whether there was clear and convincing evidence that father failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage belief that within reasonable time he could assume responsible position in life of child; claim that trial court's finding that additional time was necessary for father to form normal and healthy parent-child bond was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court's finding that father would be responsible for providing housing and financial support to child within reasonable time was clearly erroneous; whether conduct of child's mother and Commissioner of Children and Families required trial court to consider interference exception to statute (§17a-112 (j) (3) (D)) in determining that father lacked normal and healthy parent-child bond with child; whether trial court made improper comparison between father and child's foster parent in determining that father failed to sufficiently rehabilitate.</i>	
Indoor Billboard Northwest, Inc. v. M2 Systems Corp.	139
<i>Unjust enrichment; assignment of rights under promissory note; whether trial court improperly rendered judgment in favor of individual who was not plaintiff and had not assigned to plaintiff his interest in promissory note that was executed in his favor; unpreserved claim that trial court could not properly consider setoff issue without first permitting defendant to review plaintiffs' tax returns; whether trial court abused its discretion in rejecting special defense of unclean hands; whether trial court's factual finding that promissory note had been amended was clearly erroneous; whether evidence supported trial court's finding that plaintiffs were entitled to recover under theory of unjust enrichment; claim that plaintiffs failed to prove that defendant unjustly did not pay them for benefit defendant received; claim that plaintiffs did not prove that defendant's failure to pay them was to plaintiffs' detriment; whether trial court's finding that defendant's loan obligation was satisfied in part with use of plaintiffs' funds was clearly erroneous;</i>	

	<i>whether trial court erred in finding that plaintiffs satisfied defendant's debt despite plaintiffs' failure to produce evidence of written discharge of promissory note; whether trial court properly denied plaintiffs' postjudgment motion for attorney's fees and expenses.</i>	
Jan G. v. Semple		202
	<i>Alleged deprivation of plaintiff inmate's federal constitutional rights; motion to dismiss; claim that trial court improperly concluded that it lacked subject matter and personal jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims brought against defendants in their individual capacities; whether defendants were entitled to statutory (§ 4-165 (a)) immunity; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's claims brought pursuant to federal statute (42 U.S.C. § 1983) on basis of doctrine of qualified immunity; claim that trial court improperly concluded that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims brought against defendants in their official capacities on basis of doctrine of sovereign immunity.</i>	
Kaminski v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)		902
Kelsey v. Commissioner of Correction		21
	<i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in dismissing successive petition for writ of habeas corpus for failure to show good cause pursuant to statute (§ 52-470) for unreasonable delay in filing petition; whether habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner failed to sufficiently establish good cause for delay in filing successive petition; whether lack of personal knowledge of statutory deadline set forth in § 52-470 and lack of access to law library or legal resources sufficiently rebutted presumption of unreasonable delay; whether habeas court properly weighed relevant factors in dismissing successive petition.</i>	
LaPierre v. Mandell & Blau, M.D.'s, P.C.		44
	<i>Medical malpractice; motion to dismiss; personal jurisdiction; claim that trial court erred in granting motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction; whether trial court properly dismissed action for failing to comply with statute (§ 52-190a) that governs medical malpractice actions; whether allegations of complaint satisfied test set forth in Boone v. William W. Backus Hospital (272 Conn. 551) for determining whether claim sounds in medical malpractice.</i>	
Meyers v. Middlefield		264
	<i>Administrative appeal; employment termination pursuant to statute (§ 20-260); whether trial court improperly determined that record was sufficient to support decision of town's Board of Selectmen to terminate plaintiff's employment as town's building official; claim that board's decision terminating plaintiff's employment violated public policy and constituted wrongful discharge.</i>	
Miller v. Burby (Memorandum Decision).		901
Newtown v. Ostrosky		13
	<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court properly denied motion to reargue and for reconsideration of judgment of foreclosure by sale; claim that foreclosure judgment should be opened and vacated; claim that default for failure to plead entered by court clerk was invalid and could not serve as basis for foreclosure judgment; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as statement of facts and applicable law.</i>	
Palmer v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision).		902
Reliable Mechanical Contractors, LLC v. Ricketts (Memorandum Decision)		902
State v. Ervin B.		1
	<i>Threatening in second degree; claim that evidence was insufficient to support finding that defendant made physical threat against his wife for purposes of conviction of threatening in second degree in violation of statute (§ 53a-62 (a) (1)).</i>	
Vogue v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act		291
	<i>Unemployment compensation; whether trial court properly dismissed appeal from decision of Employment Security Board of Review; whether plaintiff was liable for certain unpaid unemployment compensation contributions under Unemployment Compensation Act (§ 31-222 et seq.); whether board and trial court properly applied part B of ABC test under § 31-222 (a) (1) (B) (ii) (II) in concluding that tattoo artist was plaintiff's employee; whether record contained substantial evidence for board to have determined that provision of tattoo services was within plaintiff's usual course of business and part of its business enterprise; claim that board and trial court focused solely on plaintiff's advertisements and not on other findings that did not support board's determination.</i>	

Wittman v. Intense Movers, Inc. 87
Corporate dissolution; breach of fiduciary duty; notice to purchase shares of company pursuant to statute (§ 33-900 (b)); motion to enforce settlement agreement; whether defendants established that trial court improperly enforced settlement agreement.