

**Cumulative Table of Cases**  
**Connecticut Appellate Reports**  
**Volume 214**

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

Brass Mill Center, LLC v. Subway Real Estate Corp. . . . .	379
<i>Indemnification; summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in denying summary judgment for defendant and rendering summary judgment for plaintiff; whether defendant security company had duty to defend and indemnify plaintiff in wrongful death action involving pedestrian death on mall roadway pursuant to language of its contract with plaintiff to provide security services to mall property.</i>	
CIT Bank, N.A. v. Francis . . . . .	332
<i>Foreclosure; discovery; protective order; whether trial court abused its discretion by granting protective order that precluded defendant heir from engaging in discovery to develop and pursue special defenses; claim that state and federal law prohibited plaintiff from complying with discovery requests; claim that heir could have amended stricken special defenses or obtained discovery from sources other than plaintiff; claim that heir was required to file affidavit pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 17-47) in response to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment as to special defenses.</i>	
Davis v. Property Owners Assn. of Moodus Lake Shores, Inc. . . . .	165
<i>Declaratory judgment; motion for summary judgment; res judicata; restrictive covenants; deed rights; whether trial court erred in granting motion for summary judgment when it determined that plaintiffs' claims were barred by doctrine of res judicata; claim that trial court improperly determined that present claims could have been raised in first action; whether plaintiffs' claims in present action were same as those in first action.</i>	
Deutsche Bank AG v. Vik. . . . .	487
<i>Tortious interference with business expectancy; Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); whether plaintiff's claims against defendants were barred by litigation privilege.</i>	
Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	199
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal as to claim that petitioner's right to due process was violated when trial court denied his request for specific unanimity instruction; whether habeas court abused its discretion by denying certification to appeal as to petitioner's claims that trial counsel and first habeas counsel rendered ineffective assistance; whether habeas court erred in dismissing claim that petitioner's counsel in his second habeas action rendered ineffective assistance; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying motion to open judgment.</i>	
Doe v. New Haven. . . . .	553
<i>Negligence; governmental immunity; summary judgment; action against defendant city, defendant board of education and defendant high school principal alleging negligence for failure to properly monitor and supervise teacher who sexually abused plaintiff; whether trial court properly concluded that no genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether principal breached ministerial duty under mandatory reporting statutes (§ 17a-101a) to report reasonable suspicion of child abuse; claim that defendants violated ministerial duties to prohibit free class periods and to take attendance in every class; claim that plaintiff fell within imminent harm to identifiable persons exception to governmental immunity for discretionary acts.</i>	
Fairlake Capital, LLC v. Lathouris. . . . .	750
<i>Motion to discharge notice of lis pendens; motion to terminate stay; subject matter jurisdiction; final judgment; whether trial court's denial of motion to discharge notice of lis pendens was appealable final judgment pursuant to statute (§ 52-325c (a)); whether trial court abused its discretion in relying on discretionary stay of proceedings to decline to conduct statutorily (§§ 52-325a and 52-325b) required hearing to adjudicate merits of motion to discharge notice of lis pendens; whether trial court improperly denied motion to discharge notice of lis pendens</i>	

	<i>without conducting hearing and making findings pursuant to §§ 52-325a and 52-325b.</i>	
Francis v. Briatico . . . . .		244
	<i>Alleged violation of plaintiff prisoner's constitutional rights under federal law (42 U.S.C. § 1983); motion for summary judgment; whether trial court erred in rendering summary judgment for defendant correctional institution employees; claim that trial court erred by applying heightened standard pursuant to Whitley v. Albers (475 U.S. 312) to determine violation of eighth amendment rather than deliberate indifference standard pursuant to Estelle v. Gamble (429 U.S. 97).</i>	
Gianetti v. Neigher . . . . .		394
	<i>Legal malpractice; whether defendant, who represented plaintiff in prior action, committed professional negligence by failing to initiate claims under Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.) and for tortious interference with business expectancies; whether trial court abused its discretion by granting defendant's motion to preclude testimony of plaintiff's proposed expert witness based on plaintiff's noncompliance with rule of practice (§ 13-4) applicable to disclosure during discovery; whether sanction of preclusion of testimony by expert witness was proportional to plaintiff's noncompliance with Practice Book § 13-4; whether trial court improperly granted defendant's motion for summary judgment.</i>	
Harrigan v. Fidelity National Title Ins. Co. . . . .		787
	<i>Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); Connecticut Unfair Insurance Practices Act (CUIPA) (§ 38a-815 et seq.); whether evidence presented at trial established that defendant engaged in unfair claims settlement practices with such frequency to establish general business practice, as required to show violation of CUIPA; whether trial court's determination that plaintiff failed to set forth valid CUIPA claim was fatal to defendant's CUTPA claim.</i>	
In re Delilah G. . . . .		604
	<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court properly granted petition by petitioner father to terminate respondent mother's parental rights as to minor child; whether trial court properly determined that, pursuant to statute (§ 45a-717 (g) (2) (C)), no ongoing parent-child relationship existed between mother and child; whether cumulative effect of evidence was sufficient to justify trial court's determinations that child had no present, positive feelings toward or memories of mother; whether trial court properly determined that mother failed to establish that father's actions rendered inevitable her lack of ongoing parent-child relationship with child; claim that certain court order effectively barred mother from visiting with child; whether evidence was sufficient to support trial court's conclusion that allowing further time for reestablishment of parent-child relationship between child and mother would be detrimental to child's best interests.</i>	
In re Katia V. . . . .		468
	<i>Termination of parental rights; mootness; claim that trial court violated respondent mother's rights under Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.) in determining that Department of Children and Families had made reasonable efforts to reunify her with minor child; claim that trial court erred in denying motion to bifurcatead judicatory phase of termination proceeding from dispositional phase; claim that trial court erred in denying motion to sequester child's foster parents during trial.</i>	
In re Omar I. . . . .		1
	<i>Termination of parental rights; motion to open and set aside adoptions; whether respondent father lacked standing to challenge adoptions of his minor children.</i>	
In re Police Case Numbers: Meriden PD 20-003903, 20-005055 & Berlin PD 2020-11662. . . . .		847
	<i>Motions to quash search and seizure warrant; subject matter jurisdiction; mootness; claim that trial court erred in dismissing motions to quash on ground that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction because there was no pending criminal action against individual named in warrant; whether appeal was moot following individual's arrest stemming from same investigation that prompted search warrant.</i>	
In re Probate Appeal of Harris. . . . .		596
	<i>Probate appeal; appeal to trial court from decree of Probate Court admitting decedent's will to probate; claim that trial court erred in concluding that decedent's will was validly attested by two witnesses as required by statute (§ 45a-251); whether Supreme Court's decision in Gardner v. Balboni (218 Conn. 220) applied in circumstances of present case.</i>	

Kazemi v. Allen . . . . .	86
<i>Vexatious litigation; adverse possession; trespass; whether defendants properly appealed from final judgment; claim that trial court erred when it determined that defendants lacked probable cause to bring adverse possession and trespass counts of counterclaim; claim that trial court improperly concluded that defendants did not establish their advice of counsel defense; claim that it was improper for trial court to infer that defendants acted with malice.</i>	
K. D. v. D. D. . . . .	821
<i>Application for civil restraining order; claim that trial court erred in failing to apply objective standard to its determination when it issued civil restraining order against defendant based on pattern of threatening provision of statute (§ 46b-15 (a)); whether § 46b-15 contains any statutory language requiring subjective-objective analysis.</i>	
Konover Development Corp. v. Waterbury Omega, LLC . . . . .	648
<i>Breach of contract; prejudgment remedy; claim that trial court improperly granted application for prejudgment remedy; claim that trial court improperly concluded that plaintiff had established probable cause that defendant had breached oral agreement relating to plaintiff's management of rooftop wireless telecommunications agreements on behalf of defendant; whether enforcement of oral management agreement was barred by statute (§ 20-325a), rule against perpetuities, or statute of frauds.</i>	
Lending Home Funding Corp. v. REI Holdings, LLC . . . . .	703
<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court erred in determining it was without subject matter jurisdiction to hear motion to open and vacate judgment of strict foreclosure; whether timely filed motion to reargue or to reconsider trial court's denial of motion to open and vacate foreclosure judgment triggered automatic stay provision in applicable rule of practice (§ 61-11 (a)) until parties received notice of court's ruling on motion to reargue, thereby rendering law day that fell within extended appeal period without legal effect.</i>	
Levco Tech, Inc. v. Kelly . . . . .	257
<i>Declaratory judgment; action seeking determination of number of shares of plaintiff corporation owned by certain shareholder; whether trial court improperly determined that any trust created by plaintiff's shareholder was revocable; whether trial court properly determined that plaintiff's sale of stock to certain shareholder was invalid due to inadequate notice of board meeting at which sale was approved.</i>	
Maye v. Canady . . . . .	455
<i>Landlord-tenant; action to recover possession of certain premises and personal property following allegedly unlawful entry and detainer by defendants in violation of statute (§ 47a-43); reviewability of claim that trial court improperly found that plaintiff and defendant had landlord-tenant relationship; claim that trial court erred in its calculation of damages award; whether trial court's award for certain of plaintiff's moving expenses was clearly erroneous.</i>	
Mention v. Kensington Square Apartments. . . . .	720
<i>Housing code enforcement; whether trial court had subject matter jurisdiction over evidence of housing code violations that predated filing of complaint; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant violated housing code; whether housing code, as applied to defendant, was unconstitutionally vague; claim that defendant failed to exhaust administrative remedies; claim that defendant failed to meet its burden for review of unpreserved claim pursuant to State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233); whether trial court erred in calculating amount of rent abatement due to plaintiff based on her share of subsidized rent.</i>	
Michael G. v. Commissioner of Correction. . . . .	358
<i>Habeas corpus; dismissal of third habeas petition as untimely pursuant to applicable statute (§ 52-470 (d) and (e)); claim that habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether habeas court abused its discretion in determining that petitioner failed to demonstrate good cause for delay in filing third habeas petition; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying motion for disqualification of habeas judge.</i>	
Miller v. Doe . . . . .	35
<i>Alleged violation of plaintiff prisoner's constitutional rights under federal law (42 U.S.C. § 1983); claim that defendant correctional officer acted with deliberate indifference in violation of eighth amendment when defendant transported plaintiff in vehicle that he drove erratically and unsafely while plaintiff was not secured by seat belt; whether trial court improperly denied defendant's motion for summary judgment on basis of qualified immunity; whether defendant's</i>	

	<i>conduct while transporting plaintiff violated clearly established constitutional right; whether defendant's conduct was severe enough to constitute obvious constitutional violation.</i>	
Olson v. Olson . . . . .	<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion to dismiss; whether trial court improperly dismissed motion for modification of alimony for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.</i>	4
Reiner v. Reiner . . . . .	<i>Declaratory judgment; contract interpretation; claim that term "interest," as used in buyout provision of settlement agreement for certain parcels of real estate, meant "equitable interest"; claim that trial court erred in concluding that amount required to buy out defendant's interests in certain real property pursuant to parties' settlement agreement was to be calculated by multiplying his percentage interest in each property by difference of its fair market value minus any outstanding mortgage debt.</i>	63
Rek v. Pettit . . . . .	<i>Motion for review of order determining that no automatic appellate stay was in effect; motion for review of order denying motion for discretionary stay; claim that trial court abused its discretion in ordering parties to comply with orders regarding therapy and visitation of minor child pending appeal; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying appellate stay of orders as not in best interest of minor child; whether trial court abused its discretion in suspending therapy between minor child and therapist pending appeal.</i>	854
Sargent, Sargent & Jacobs, LLC v. Thoele . . . . .	<i>Interpleader; action for interpleader brought by escrow agent to determine rights to funds deposited by purchaser to ensure performance of obligations under real estate purchase and sale agreement; cross claim by purchaser that seller breached purchase and sale agreement; whether parol evidence rule precluded consideration of letter of intent related to sewer easement on property signed two years prior to purchase and sale agreement at issue; whether purchaser had actual knowledge of potential sewer easement on property; whether potential sewer easement was encumbrance on property; claim that trial court erred in determining that seller's failure to disclose potential sewer easement was material breach of purchase and sale agreement.</i>	179
Simms v. Zucco . . . . .	<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion to modify alimony; whether trial court incorrectly determined that plaintiff's service of notice of motion to modify alimony sent to defendant's out of state residence by certified mail by state marshal was legally sufficient pursuant to statutes (§§ 52-50 and 52-52); whether trial court erred in opening judgment of dissolution and modifying defendant's alimony obligation in violation of automatic bankruptcy stay imposed by federal law (11 U.S.C. § 362); whether trial court abused its discretion in increasing defendant's alimony obligation and ordering retroactive alimony.</i>	525
State v. Glass . . . . .	<i>Burglary in first degree; robbery in first degree; claim that evidence was insufficient to establish that defendant was perpetrator of crimes; whether evidence that defendant was major contributor to mixture of touch DNA found on fragment of latex glove used during commission of crimes was sufficient to determine that he was most recent or sole wearer of glove.</i>	132
State v. Gonzalez . . . . .	<i>Assault in first degree; carrying pistol without permit; motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that No. 18-63, § 2, of the 2018 Public Acts (P.A. 18-63) was intended to apply retroactively to defendant's sentence imposing period of special parole because statute governing special parole (§ 54-125e) was procedural rather than substantive; claim that P.A. 18-63 was intended to apply retroactively because legislative history and amendatory language demonstrated that it was meant to clarify § 54-125e rather than effect change in law.</i>	511
State v. Guild . . . . .	<i>Petition filed pursuant to statute (§ 17a-593) for order to extend commitment of acquittee to jurisdiction of Psychiatric Security Review Board; whether trial court's denial of acquittee's motion to dismiss state's petition to extend his commitment constituted appealable final judgment pursuant to State v. Curcio (191 Conn. 27).</i>	121
State v. Sweet . . . . .	<i>Larceny in third degree; identify theft in third degree; persistent serious felony offender; claim that evidence was insufficient to prove that defendant appro-</i>	679

*priated in excess of \$2000 to himself; unpreserved claim that property report created by investigating police officer and victim's statement to police were improperly admitted into evidence in violation of sixth amendment right to confrontation; unpreserved claim that letters from two credit card issuers regarding fraudulent charges, which were admitted as past recollections recorded under provision (§ 8-3 (6)) of Connecticut Code of Evidence, constituted testimonial hearsay that was admitted in violation of sixth amendment right to confrontation; claim that statements of card issuers were improperly admitted into evidence as past recollections recorded because information contained therein was not personally known to victim, through whom statements were presented.*

State v. Turner . . . . . 584

*Murder; assault in first degree; motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court made materially false assumptions about defendant's potential for rehabilitation at his sentencing proceeding when contrasted with youth related brain science set forth in Miller v. Alabama (567 U.S. 460), and its progeny; whether trial court erred in holding that defendant failed to state colorable claim for relief; claim that defendant was entitled to evidentiary hearing to present expert testimony on juvenile brain science in support of his motion to correct illegal sentence.*

State v. Waters . . . . . 294

*Operating motor vehicle while under influence of intoxicating liquor in violation of statute (§ 14-227a (a) (1)); sufficiency of evidence; reviewability of unpreserved claim that testimony by state's expert witness about likely blood alcohol content of person who was slurring his speech violated § 14-227a (c) when defendant was charged under behavioral subdivision of § 14-227a (a); whether trial court committed plain error in permitting opinion testimony by state's expert witness that was implicitly related to defendant's blood alcohol content in behavioral case under § 14-227a (a) (1); whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that defendant failed to establish proper foundation to cross-examine state's expert witness about whether other substances could have affected rate at which individual can become visibly intoxicated from alcohol; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress statements defendant made at accident scene and at police station.*

Velasco v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . . 831

*Habeas corpus; whether habeas court erred in dismissing petition for writ of habeas corpus; whether release provision in settlement agreement between petitioner and state was unconscionable; whether settlement agreement was enforceable with respect to habeas petition.*

Wilmington Trust, National Assn. v. N'Guessan . . . . . 229

*Foreclosure; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in granting plaintiff's motion for summary judgment without considering applicability of doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel; claim that trial court abused its discretion by sustaining plaintiff's objections to defendant's interrogatories and requests for production.*