

**Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 210**

Berka v. Waterbury (Memorandum Decision)	901
Marshall v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles	109
<i>Administrative appeal; suspension of motor vehicle operator's license by defendant Commissioner of Motor Vehicles pursuant to statute (§ 14-227b); claim that trial court improperly concluded that Department of Motor Vehicles hearing officer did not abuse her discretion by admitting certain exhibit into evidence; whether arresting officer's failure to mail report of incident to department within three business days of plaintiff's arrest as required by § 14-227b (c) rendered it unreliable.</i>	
MTGLQ Investors, L.P. v. Lakner (Memorandum Decision)	901
Poce v. O & G Industries, Inc.	82
<i>Negligence; negligent infliction of emotional distress; premises liability; recklessness; whether trial court erred in granting in part defendant's motion to strike; whether trial court erred in granting defendant's motion for summary judgment; adoption of trial court's memoranda of decision as proper statements of relevant facts and analyses of applicable law on issues.</i>	
Salce v. Cardello.	66
<i>Probate appeal; trusts; claim that defendant violated in terrorem clauses contained in will and trust agreement; whether defendant filed creditor's claim against estate in violation of in terrorem clauses contained in will and trust agreement; whether in terrorem clauses prohibiting beneficiaries of will and trust from challenging any action taken by fiduciary were unenforceable as matter of public policy.</i>	
State v. LaMotte	44
<i>Robbery in first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion by not affording defendant evidentiary hearing on motion to withdraw guilty pleas; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to pursue alibi defense; claim that defendant was under duress during plea proceeding because state's inspector had coerced and given false information about defendant to witness who was to testify at defendant's trial.</i>	
State v. McCarthy	1
<i>Kidnapping in second degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in second degree; larceny in second degree; claim that defendant was entitled to new trial because trial court improperly failed to provide jury with incidental restraint instruction in accordance with State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509); claim that there was insufficient evidence to support conviction of kidnapping in second degree; claim that state failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt that defendant intended to prevent liberation of victims beyond that which was incidental to and necessary to commit larceny and that he used or threatened to use physical force or intimidation to restrain his victims; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to due process and abused its discretion by denying his requests to remove his leg shackles at trial.</i>	