

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 216

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Atlantic St. Heritage Associates, LLC v. Atlantic Realty Co.	530
<i>Prescriptive easement; motions for summary judgment; claim that trial court lacked authority to grant plaintiff's motion for summary judgment; whether trial court improperly addressed sua sponte certain of defendants' special defenses; claim that trial court improperly determined that no genuine issues of material fact existed as to plaintiff's prescriptive easement claim; claim that trial court improperly denied defendants' cross motion for summary judgment; whether plaintiff was precluded from simultaneously asserting deeded and prescriptive easement rights.</i>	
Ayuso v. Commissioner of Correction	234
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion by denying petitioner certification to appeal from judgment denying habeas petition; claim that inadequate treatment for certain of petitioner's medical conditions constituted deliberate indifference to petitioner's medical needs in violation of eighth amendment to United States constitution.</i>	
Bank of New York Mellon v. Mercier (Memorandum Decision).	901
Canales v. Commissioner of Correction	827
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly dismissed habeas petition as untimely pursuant to statute (§ 52-470 (c) (2)); whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal from judgment dismissing habeas petition; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in determining that petitioner failed to establish good cause to overcome rebuttable presumption of unreasonable delay.</i>	
Conroy v. Idlibi (Memorandum Decision)	901
Delena v. Grachitorena	225
<i>Petition for visitation; whether trial court erred in denying petition for visitation with minor grandchildren pursuant to statute (§ 46b-59); whether trial court erred in finding that plaintiff had not demonstrated, by clear and convincing evidence, that she had parent-like relationship with grandchildren; whether trial court was required to determine whether denial of petition would result in real and significant harm to grandchildren.</i>	
Donald v. Commissioner of Correction.	63
<i>Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of trial counsel at sentencing proceeding; modification of sentence by Sentence Review Division of Superior Court; whether state violated petitioner's due process right to fair trial by promising alleged accomplice sentence reduction in exchange for testimony against petitioner and by failing to disclose material evidence concerning credibility of police detective; claim by respondent Commissioner of Correction that judgment could be affirmed on alternative ground that petitioner failed to prove his trial counsel rendered deficient performance at sentencing proceeding; claim that habeas court incorrectly concluded that trial counsel's deficient performance did not entitle petitioner to presumption of prejudice pursuant to United States v. Cronin (466 U.S. 648) and Davis v. Commissioner of Correction (319 Conn. 548); whether habeas court erred in ruling that it was barred under Sentence Review Act (§ 51-194 et seq.) from reviewing or granting relief from sentence review division's modification of petitioner's sentence.</i>	
Downing v. Dragone.	306
<i>Breach of contract; unjust enrichment; claim that trial court improperly found that written contract existed between parties; whether defendant assented to unsigned written agreement by accepting plaintiff's services thereunder and by failing to object to its terms; claim that judicial estoppel should have prevented trial court from crediting plaintiff's testimony; claim that trial court improperly admitted hearsay evidence on issue of damages.</i>	

Fischer v. People's United Bank, N.A.	426
<i>Breach of contract; breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); tortious interference with business expectancies; negligent infliction of emotional distress; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; standing; claim that trial court improperly held that plaintiff limited partnership lacked standing to bring action against its mortgage lender after lender rescinded offer to refinance mortgage; whether member of limited partnership's general partner, acting alone, had authority pursuant to relevant corporate governance documents to permit limited partnership to commence underlying action; claim that guarantor of mortgage and his real estate company had standing to bring action against defendants; whether judgment dismissing certain counts of complaint brought by guarantor and his real estate company was appealable final judgment.</i>	
Gonzalez v. New Britain	479
<i>Negligence; motion to strike; motion for judgment; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that plaintiff's amended complaint was legally insufficient because she did not plead facts demonstrating that she was identifiable victim for purposes of identifiable person-imminent harm exception to governmental immunity; claim that plaintiff fell within exception to governmental immunity because she was legally compelled to be on property at time of incident because she was tenant at property where incident occurred.</i>	
Greenfield v. Commissioner of Correction (See Stenner v. Commissioner of Correction)	596
Healey v. Mantell	514
<i>Breach of fiduciary duty; legal malpractice; negligent misrepresentation; motion to dismiss; trusts; whether beneficiaries of trust created under will had standing to sue coexecutors of will; whether defendants were aggrieved by trial court's determination that plaintiffs had standing as beneficiaries of trust under will to bring claims against defendants as coexecutors of estate; whether defendants could be collaterally estopped in subsequent proceeding from challenging plaintiffs' standing to sue defendants as coexecutors; whether trial court's determination regarding plaintiffs' standing was dictum; dismissal of appeal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.</i>	
Hebrand v. Hebrand.	210
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to open and vacate prior trial court's postjudgment modification of plaintiff's alimony obligation; claim that modification court lacked subject matter jurisdiction to consider and modify alimony obligation; whether trial court's finding that defendant failed to establish that plaintiff fraudulently induced her to enter into alimony modification agreement was clearly erroneous; claim that modification court improperly failed to find occurrence of substantial change in parties' circumstances and to conform its order to those changes.</i>	
Hodge v. Commissioner of Correction	616
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed habeas petition, on court's own motion, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-29), without first providing petitioner with prior notice and opportunity to be heard; Brown v. Commissioner of Correction (345 Conn. 1) and Boria v. Commissioner of Correction (345 Conn. 39), discussed.</i>	
Horrocks v. Keepers, Inc..	275
<i>Arbitration; whether trial court properly granted plaintiffs' application to confirm arbitration awards and denied defendants' motion to vacate awards; claim that trial court erred by failing to conclude that arbitrator's calculation of damages constituted manifest disregard of law; reviewability of claims that trial court erred by not holding that arbitrator's awards violated legitimate public policy of freedom of contract and by failing to sever enforceable and unenforceable terms of parties' employment agreement and to determine that defendants were entitled to credit against wages for entertainment fees paid to plaintiffs.</i>	
Idlibi v. Hartford Courant Co.	851
<i>Defamation; intentional misrepresentation; motion for summary judgment; fair report privilege; claim that trial court improperly granted summary judgment as to claims of defamation; claim that trial court erroneously concluded that fair report privilege applied to allegedly defamatory statements made by defendant publisher; whether fair report privilege applied to statement containing statistic that trial court determined was substantially true; claim that trial court improperly granted summary judgment on plaintiff's intentional misrepresentation claim.</i>	

Ingles v. Ingles	782
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion for contempt; whether trial court correctly found that plaintiff was not in contempt for allegedly failing to comply with pendente lite order that he make certain mortgage payments toward marital home; whether trial court's time limited periodic alimony award was abuse of its discretion; whether trial court failed to consider factors set forth in applicable statute (§ 46b-82) in fashioning alimony award; whether trial court improperly failed to value parties' pensions and equalize their distribution; claim that trial court abused its discretion in declining to award defendant attorney's fees.</i>	
In re Aubrey K.	632
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court properly found that respondent mother was unable and/or unwilling to benefit from services offered by Department of Children and Families; whether trial court improperly determined that termination of mother's parental rights was in child's best interest.</i>	
In re Edgar S. (See In re Maliyah M.)	702
In re G. H.	671
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court correctly concluded that respondent mother failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage belief that, within reasonable time, mother could assume responsible position in lives of minor children; whether inconsistent statements in trial court's memorandum of decision required reversal of judgments; claim that trial court erroneously concluded that termination of mother's parental rights was in best interests of minor children.</i>	
In re Lil'Patrick T.	240
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court correctly concluded that respondent father failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage belief that, within reasonable time, father could assume responsible position in life of minor child; whether trial court made improper determinations with respect to father's drug use; claim that record did not support trial court's finding that father had unresolved mental health issues that served as barrier to reunification with minor child; whether trial court properly found that domestic violence between respondent mother and father was impediment to rehabilitation; claim that father's lack of stable housing was not ground for termination of his parental rights; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that termination of father's parental rights was in best interest of minor child; whether trial court committed plain error in canvassing father concerning his right to testify.</i>	
In re Maliyah M.	702
<i>Termination of parental rights; unreserved claim by respondent parents in three separate trials that they were denied right to due process under fourteenth amendment to United States constitution when trial courts permitted witnesses for petitioner Commissioner of Children and Families to testify remotely via Microsoft Teams platform without first conducting evidentiary hearing to determine whether, under State v. Jarzbek (204 Conn. 683), compelling need existed for witnesses to testify remotely; unreserved claim that parents had unqualified right to hearing at which petitioner would bear burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence compelling governmental interest in presenting witnesses' testimony virtually.</i>	
In re Octavia D. (See In re Maliyah M.)	702
Jaynes v. Commissioner of Correction	412
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court erred in dismissing habeas petition for failure to meet statutory (§ 52-470 (d)) filing deadline; whether habeas petition included claim of actual innocence; reviewability of claim of actual innocence asserted for first time on appeal; claim that habeas court abused its discretion by dismissing habeas petition for petitioner's failure to demonstrate good cause for untimely filing pursuant to § 52-470 (e); whether record contained ample support for habeas court's finding that petitioner's testimony, without more, did not overcome statutory presumption of unreasonable delay.</i>	
J. M. v. E. M.	814
<i>Summary process; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that defendant's tenancy was reinstated after plaintiff accepted subsequent payments from defendant after service of notice to quit and after quit date specified in notice; claim that governor's executive orders promulgated during COVID-19 pandemic altered required analysis of summary process case; request by plaintiff that this court adjudicate merits of defendant's special defenses, notwithstanding that trial court did not reach merits of such defenses.</i>	

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. v. Shack (Memorandum Decision)	902
Kalican v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	901
Laiuppa v. Moritz	344
<i>Accidental failure of suit statute (§ 52-592); motion to dismiss; motion for summary judgment; motion for reargument; whether trial court improperly concluded that no genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether defendant received actual or effective notice of plaintiff's previous negligence action, which had been dismissed for insufficient service of process, within time limited by law pursuant to § 52-592; whether trial court improperly determined that § 52-592 was inapplicable and could not save plaintiff's prior action; claim that it was of no consequence that defendant did not have notice of plaintiff's prior action until after statute of limitations expired; claim that filing of appearance and discovery motions by counsel appointed by defendant's insurance company and awareness of plaintiff's prior action by defendant's attorney-in-fact through reservation of rights letter prior to expiration of limitation period provided defendant with actual or effective notice of prior action; claim that defendant's insurance company and appointed counsel were agents of defendant for purpose of receiving service of process such that notice to insurance company and appointed counsel could be imputed to defendant; claim that trial court abused its discretion in granting defendant's motion to reargue.</i>	
L. L. v. M. B.	731
<i>Domestic violence restraining order; claim that plaintiff's appeal should have been dismissed as moot; whether practical relief could be afforded to plaintiff; claim that trial court abused its discretion in concluding that plaintiff did not satisfy requirement of being family or household member necessary for relief under statute (§ 46b-15 (a)); whether trial court reasonably concluded that parties did not have recent dating relationship as required by definition of family or household member in statute (§ 46b-38a (2) (F)); whether trial court's determination that plaintiff did not fall within definition of family or household member implicated subject matter jurisdiction; whether form of judgment was improper.</i>	
Lawrence v. Gude	624
<i>Landlord-tenant; claim that trial court improperly found that tenant wife was not liable for back rent and use and occupancy under lease pursuant to statute (§ 46b-37 (b) (3)) that governs joint duties of spouses, when only tenant husband signed lease; whether trial court erred in failing to impose joint and several spousal liability as to wife pursuant to § 46-37 (b) (3).</i>	
Mazza v. Mazza	285
<i>Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motion for contempt; whether trial court improperly granted motion for contempt; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that defendant wilfully violated separation agreement; whether trial court's order of alternative relief in granting motion for contempt was improper.</i>	
Metropolitan District Commission v. Marriott International, Inc.	154
<i>Breach of contract; unjust enrichment; postjudgment motion for contempt and application to discharge lien; claim that trial court's order discharging sewer benefit assessment lien exceeded its jurisdiction; whether applicable statute (§ 7-250) provided exclusive remedy for challenging sewer benefit assessment levied by plaintiff against defendant hotel franchisor; whether trial court had jurisdiction and/or authority to order lien discharged either pursuant to its continuing jurisdiction to effectuate its summary judgment decision rendered for defendant hotel franchisor or pursuant to statute (§ 49-51) providing for discharge of invalid liens; claim that trial court's discharge of lien could have been affirmed on grounds of res judicata and/or judicial estoppel.</i>	
Moore v. Moore	179
<i>Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motion to modify alimony and child support; whether trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to modify with respect to modification of child support when it failed to address issue of whether modification was warranted on ground that child support order deviated from child support guidelines and dissolution court had failed to make requisite findings related to deviation; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that defendant did not establish substantial change in circumstances for purposes of modifying alimony obligation as required by applicable statute (§ 46b-86 (a)).</i>	
Parnoff v. Stratford	491
<i>Freedom of Information Act (§ 1-200 et seq.); Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); negligent infliction of emotional distress; claim</i>	

	<i>that trial court improperly struck plaintiff's CUTPA and negligent infliction of emotional distress claims; whether plaintiff pleaded allegations sufficient to support CUTPA and negligent infliction of emotional distress claims; whether defendants were involved in trade or commerce within meaning of CUTPA; whether plaintiff alleged facts that, if true, would create reasonably foreseeable risk of severe emotional distress; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motions to strike with prejudice.</i>	
Randolph v. Mambrino	<i>Petition for new trial; summary judgment; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that tolling provision (§ 52-595) pertaining to fraudulent concealment of cause of action did not toll applicable three year statute of limitations (§ 52-582); Turner v. State (172 Conn. App. 352), and Fichera v. Mine Hill Corp. (207 Conn. 204), discussed; whether respondents were entitled to summary judgment because petitioner failed to present evidence sufficient to demonstrate that there was genuine issue of material fact with respect to his claim that limitation period of § 52-582 was tolled by respondents' alleged fraudulent concealment of certain letters; failure to brief claim adequately.</i>	126
Simonoff v. Commissioner of Correction.	<i>Habeas corpus; failure of petitioner to address threshold question of whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal.</i>	824
Speer v. Norwich	<i>Foreclosure; mootness; subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's action seeking to enjoin tax foreclosure sale because action was moot; whether appeal was moot because restrictions associated with COVID-19 pandemic that formed basis for plaintiff's request for injunctive relief had expired and tax foreclosure sale was never consummated; whether plaintiff's case fell within capable of repetition, yet evading review exception to mootness doctrine.</i>	883
Speer v. U.S. Bank Trust, N.A.	<i>Slander of title; claim that trial court erred in granting defendant's motion to strike; claim that motion to strike did not comply with Practice Book (2013) § 10-41; claim that motion to strike was not directed to operative complaint; claim that trial court erred in granting motion for judgment because automatic appellate stay was in effect.</i>	506
State v. Marcello E.	<i>Assault first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting uncharged misconduct evidence that involved prior altercations between defendant and victim during which defendant punched and hit victim; whether uncharged misconduct was admissible under provision (§ 4-5 (c)) of Connecticut Code of Evidence to show intent on part of defendant to assault victim; claim that uncharged misconduct was not relevant to intent or similar in nature to charged crime; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that probative value of misconduct evidence outweighed its prejudicial effect; claim that uncharged misconduct was inadmissible under State v. Juan J. (344 Conn. 1), which prohibited use of uncharged misconduct to prove intent in general intent crimes; whether admission of uncharged misconduct evidence was harmful.</i>	1
State v. McLaurin	<i>Unlawful restraint first degree; robbery first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery first degree; criminal possession of firearm; carrying pistol without permit; conspiracy to commit larceny fourth degree; motion to suppress identification; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that one-on-one showup procedure police arranged for witness' identification of defendant was not unnecessarily suggestive; whether exigent circumstances justified use of one-on-one showup procedure; claim that police conducted one-on-one showup procedure in suggestive place and suggestive manner.</i>	449
Stenner v. Commissioner of Correction	<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas courts properly dismissed successive habeas petitions as untimely pursuant to statute (§ 52-470 (d) and (e)); claims that habeas courts abused their discretion in concluding that petitioners failed to establish good cause to overcome rebuttable presumption of unreasonable delay.</i>	596
Taylor v. Commissioner of Correction	<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court improperly dismissed habeas petition for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether habeas court improperly dismissed claim that petitioner was denied procedural due process because he failed to sufficiently allege cognizable liberty interest under stigma plus test; whether habeas court</i>	570

	<i>improperly dismissed petitioner's equal protection claim in which he alleged that he was treated differently from similarly situated prisoners because of his alienage and British citizenship; whether habeas court improperly dismissed petitioner's claim that he was subjected to cruel and unusual punishment as result of respondent Commissioner of Correction's management of COVID-19 pandemic at correctional facility in which petitioner was incarcerated.</i>	
10	<i>Marietta Street, LLC v. Melnick Properties, LLC.</i>	262
	<i>Negligence; environmental contamination; summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly determined that no genuine issue of material fact existed and that defendants were entitled to judgment as matter of law; whether trial court improperly used summary judgment as sanction for plaintiff's failure to comply with discovery; whether plaintiff presented sufficient evidence in opposition to motion for summary judgment that demonstrated its entitlement to trial.</i>	
307	<i>White Street Realty, LLC v. Beaver Brook Group, LLC</i>	750
	<i>Contracts; option to purchase real property; unjust enrichment; claim that plaintiff was entitled to specific performance of option to purchase; whether trial court improperly granted defendant's motion to dismiss action on ground that action was moot because, after plaintiff commenced action, parties executed purchase and sale agreement regarding leased property that purportedly superseded option to purchase; whether trial court improperly determined that motion to dismiss implicated mootness and court's subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court improperly failed to hold evidentiary hearing on motion to dismiss; whether trial court improperly concluded that action, including unjust enrichment claim, was moot in its entirety.</i>	
	<i>Tracey v. Miami Beach Assn.</i>	379
	<i>Land use; preclusion; enforcement of prior judgment; claim that trial court erred in concluding that prior judgment regarding rights of general public to freely access and use parcel of waterfront property owned by defendant precluded defendant from restricting public access to and use of that property; whether trial court's authority to enforce prior judgment was implicated by doctrine of res judicata; whether defendant's conduct fell within scope of 1953 judgment; claim that plaintiffs in present action were not entitled to benefits of 1953 judgment; whether plaintiffs in present action were in privity with plaintiffs in prior action; claim that passage of time since prior judgment made its enforcement inequitable.</i>	
	<i>Tremont Public Advisors, LLC v. Materials Innovation & Recycling Authority</i>	775
	<i>Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); motion to strike; whether trial court properly granted defendant's motion to strike on ground that defendant was exempt from liability under CUTPA pursuant to governmental exemption provision (§ 42-110c (a) (1)); whether trial court properly found that conduct of defendant was exempt from CUTPA liability under § 42-110c (a) (1).</i>	
	<i>U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Rago</i>	200
	<i>Foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly exceeded scope of remand order in opening judgment of strict foreclosure to make updated findings regarding fair market value of property and amount of debt at issue; whether defendant was afforded due process when trial court made updated findings sua sponte and without adequate notice to parties or opportunity to be heard.</i>	
	<i>Villafane v. Commissioner of Correction</i>	839
	<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion by denying petitioner's petition for certification to appeal; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed habeas petition, on court's own motion, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-29), without first providing petitioner with prior notice and opportunity to be heard.</i>	
	<i>Wahba v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.</i>	236
	<i>Foreclosure; proceedings on remand; claim that trial court erred in interpreting Appellate Court's remand order as prohibiting it from changing nature of judgment from judgment of strict foreclosure to foreclosure by sale.</i>	
	<i>Waterbury v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act</i>	717
	<i>Unemployment compensation benefits; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff employer's appeal from decision of Board of Review of Employment Security Appeals Division finding claimant was entitled to certain unemployment compensation benefits; whether claimant was properly discharged for wilful misconduct under statute (§ 31-236) for violating agreement with employer by testing positive for marijuana; whether trial court erred in adopting finding of board that Palliative Use of Marijuana Act (§ 21a-408 et seq.) and, specifically, provi-</i>	

sion (§ 21a-408p (b) (3)) of that act providing protections to qualifying patient, were applicable to case.

Waterford v. Traylor (Memorandum Decision) 902

Westry v. Litchfield Visitation Center. 869

Racial discrimination; motion for default for failure to plead; motion to dismiss; claim that trial court abused its discretion in granting defendant's motion to set aside default; claim that trial court improperly granted defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's failure to commence action within time limitation set forth in statute (§ 46a-101 (e)); whether plaintiff properly preserved certain claims for appellate review.