

**Cumulative Table of Cases**  
**Connecticut Appellate Reports**  
**Volume 213**

---

<p>Barclays Bank Delaware v. Bamford . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Debt collection action; motion to disqualify; motion for default for failure to disclose defense pursuant to rule of practice (§ 13-19); whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to disqualify trial judge on basis of impropriety; claim that defendant had no obligation to disclose defense pursuant to Practice Book § 13-19; whether trial court properly admitted billing account statements pursuant to business records exception to hearsay rule.</i></p>	1
<p>Doe v. Board of Education . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Negligence; recklessness; respondeat superior liability; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in granting defendants' motions for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly failed to view evidence in light most favorable to plaintiffs; whether trial court properly determined that defendant public school employees and board of education were protected by statutory (§ 10-222l) immunity with respect to negligence allegations premised on their failure to comply with safe school climate plan following reports of bullying; whether trial court properly determined that defendants were protected by governmental immunity pursuant to applicable statute (§ 52-557n (a) (2) (B)) with respect to negligence claims involving their discretionary acts taken in response to reports of bullying; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of individual defendants with respect to recklessness claim; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motions for summary judgment with respect to respondeat superior liability claim against town and its board of education; claim that trial court improperly granted motions for summary judgment with respect to claims alleging that superintendent of school and board of education retaliated against plaintiffs for reporting instances of bullying.</i></p>	22
<p>Dolan v. Dolan . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Dissolution of marriage; motion to modify unallocated alimony and child support; whether trial court abused its discretion by modifying definition of "pre-tax compensation from employment" in parties' separation agreement; whether trial court's modification of definition of term in separation agreement conflicted with Supreme Court's decision in Gay v. Gay (266 Conn. 641).</i></p>	112
<p>Russbach v. Yanez-Ventura . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Uninsured motorist coverage; whether trial court improperly concluded that defendant insurance company's failure to comply with requirements of applicable statute (§ 38a-336 (a) (2)) was excused; claim that Frantz v. United States Fleet Leasing, Inc. (245 Conn. 727), Kinsey v. Pacific Employers Ins. Co. (277 Conn. 398), and McDonald v. National Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, PA (79 Conn. App. 800), created exception to statutory requirements of § 38a-336 (a) (2) for every case that involved commercial fleet or garage insurance policy; whether trial court improperly determined that automobile policy provided for standard, rather than conversion, uninsured motorist insurance coverage.</i></p>	77
<p>Sessa v. Reale . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Probate appeal; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that Superior Court had subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's probate appeal; whether Probate Court denied plaintiff's application to hear and decide rejected claim or decided merits of rejected claim underlying application; whether statute (§ 45a-364 (b)) required plaintiff to commence suit following Probate Court's denial of his application to hear and decide rejected claim rather than to file probate appeal; claim that Superior Court improperly granted motion to dismiss when defendant raised alleged failure to satisfy time requirement for filing suit under § 45a-364 (b) in motion to dismiss instead of by special defense.</i></p>	151
<p>Sokolovsky v. Mulholland . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Administrative appeal, discrimination; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that trial court erred in concluding that statutory (§ 46a-101) ninety day limitation period for commencing action in Superior Court pursuant to statute (§ 46a-100) was subject matter jurisdictional; claim that trial court</i></p>	128

*improperly dismissed plaintiff's action; claim that trial court erred by not considering action commenced on date that plaintiff filed his application for waiver of fees; whether trial court erred in concluding that plaintiff was required to plead continuing course of conduct doctrine in his complaint.*