

**Cumulative Table of Cases  
Connecticut Appellate Reports  
Volume 212**

---

<p>Arrico v. Board of Education . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Workers' compensation; appeal from decision of Compensation Review Board, which reversed in part Workers' Compensation Commissioner's decision to approve form 36 filed by defendants seeking to discontinue or to reduce plaintiff's workers' compensation benefits; claim that board misconstrued commissioner's decision as including finding that plaintiff was totally disabled as result of preexisting, noncompensable injuries; claim that board misconstrued commissioner's conclusion that further medical care of plaintiff's compensable injuries was palliative; claim that board, in denying plaintiff's motion for articulation or reconsideration, violated statute (§ 51-183c) by denying his request for order that issues on remand be tried de novo before different commissioner.</i></p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Gilman v. Shames . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Wrongful death; medical malpractice; bystander emotional distress; motion to dismiss; claim that trial court improperly denied defendants' motion to dismiss; whether Claims Commissioner waived sovereign immunity with respect to plaintiff's claims; claim that accidental failure of suit statute (§ 52-592) exempted plaintiff from two year statute of limitations for wrongful death action.</i></p>	<p>147</p>
<p>Jones v. Commissioner of Correction. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that habeas court deprived petitioner of his constitutional and statutory rights by failing to admit into evidence or to consider transcripts of petitioner's underlying criminal trial; claim that habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner's trial counsel did not provide ineffective assistance; claim that habeas court improperly concluded that there was no violation of Brady v. Maryland (373 U.S. 83) at petitioner's underlying criminal trial.</i></p>	<p>117</p>
<p>New Milford v. Standard Demolition Services, Inc. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Breach of contract; claim that trial court misapplied state and federal environmental regulations; claim that trial court erred in failing to find that defendant's obligations under parties' contract were impossible to perform; claim that trial court improperly determined that plaintiff lawfully had terminated contract; claim that evidence of certain change orders executed by plaintiff in connection with subsequent contract with another contractor, pursuant to which plaintiff agreed to modify terms of contract, constituted admissions that plaintiff's contract with defendant was defective and could not be performed by defendant as written; claim that trial court erred in making its award of damages to plaintiff.</i></p>	<p>30</p>
<p>Sease v. Commissioner of Correction. . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether it was premature to decide whether judgment of habeas court should be reversed on merits; whether habeas court erred in determining that no prejudice to petitioner had been established under Strickland v. Washington (466 U.S. 668); whether there was reasonable probability that petitioner's sentence would have been less severe in light of mitigating evidence that was presented at habeas trial and not presented at sentencing; remand to habeas court for making of underlying factual findings from record and for determination, based on those findings, of whether petitioner has shown that counsel's representation at sentencing constituted constitutionally deficient performance.</i></p>	<p>99</p>