

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 217

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Ah Min Holding, LLC v. Hartford	574
<i>Breach of contract; claim that trial court improperly read into tax abatement agreement certain provisions of General Statutes (§§ 47a-1 and 47a-7) and defendant city's municipal code (§ 18-2) regarding maintenance obligations; whether agreement was unambiguous; whether plaintiff's contractual duty to "maintain" properties encompassed obligation to provide repair and general upkeep to dwelling units; claim that trial court incorrectly found that defendant had contractual right to terminate agreement based on violations of §§ 47a-1 and 47a-7 and § 18-2 of municipal code; claim that trial court incorrectly found that plaintiff failed to prove that defendant breached agreement.</i>	
Anders v. Anders (Memorandum Decision)	904
Aviles v. Barnhill	435
<i>Premises liability; negligence; motion for summary judgment; whether trial court correctly concluded that defendant landlord did not owe plaintiffs duty of care in connection with attack by tenant's dog under theory of premises liability because attack did not occur on property that landlord controlled; claim that our Supreme Court's decision in Giacalone v. Housing Authority (306 Conn. 399) broadened scope of landlord's duty under theory of premises liability; request that this court adopt provision (§ 379A) of Restatement (Second) of Torts.</i>	
Barthelemy v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	902
Bennett v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	901
Bennett v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	901
Booth v. Park Terrace II Mutual Housing Ltd. Partnership	398
<i>Premises liability; negligence; summary judgment; request for admission pursuant to rule of practice (§ 13-22); whether trial court properly determined that no genuine issues of material fact existed in granting defendants' motions for summary judgment; whether trial court properly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact with respect to ownership or maintenance of area of plaintiff's alleged fall; whether trial court properly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact with respect to extent and location of defective condition causing plaintiff's alleged fall; claim that operative complaint alleged positive acts that would create genuine issue of material fact as to whether defendants engaged in positive acts involving area in which plaintiff allegedly fell; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's request to amend revised complaint; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's motion to preclude expert witness affidavit offered in support of motion for summary judgment.</i>	
Britto v. Bimbo Foods, Inc.	134
<i>Workers' compensation; motion to preclude; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner denying plaintiff employee's motion to preclude defendant employer from contesting liability as to plaintiff's claimed injuries; whether board properly affirmed commissioner's decision in light of commissioner's findings that defendant did not receive form 30C notice of claim that was sent to it by certified mail and, therefore, that defendant did not receive proper notice of claim; claim that board improperly imposed on plaintiff burden to establish that form 30C was returned to him because defendant had rejected it.</i>	
Caviness v. Danbury Mall, LLC (Memorandum Decision)	903
Circulent, Inc. v. Hatch & Bailey Co.	622
<i>Breach of contract; claim that trial court incorrectly found that defendant paid in full amounts owed to plaintiff under parties' agreements; claim that trial court incorrectly found that term of one agreement was one year rather than three years; whether trial court's conclusions were unsupported by evidence; whether trial court's conclusions constituted harmful error; whether new trial on breach of contract claims was necessary.</i>	

D. S. v. D. S.	530
<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly concluded that defendant's prospective interest in receipt of retirement benefits pursuant to her law firm's partnership agreement did not constitute marital property subject to equitable distribution pursuant to applicable statute (§ 46b-81); claim that trial court improperly issued alimony order that represented improper delegation of judicial authority or abuse of its discretion.</i>	
Freidheim v. McLaughlin	767
<i>Injunction; declaratory judgment; summary judgment; action seeking to quiet title with respect to view easement in deed to defendants' property in connection with defendants' alleged obstruction of plaintiff's view of Long Island Sound; whether trial court improperly granted defendants' motion for summary judgment as to count of complaint seeking to quiet title to easement when court had determined that easement existed in deed and that defendants were obstructing plaintiff's water view; whether trial court improperly rendered summary judgment as to scope of easement when court erroneously determined that language in deed was clear and unambiguous; whether trial court improperly determined as matter of law that easement limited height of fence or hedge only along property line between parcels; whether trial court improperly determined that plaintiff's claim that defendants' pool house violated easement's outbuilding restriction was barred by statute of limitations (§ 52-575a); whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment as to claim that defendants maliciously planted evergreen trees that violated easement's height restriction for purpose of obstructing plaintiff's water view; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment as to count that alleged violation of statutes (§§ 52-570 and 52-480) pertaining to defendants' malicious planting of trees that exceeded height restriction in easement.</i>	
Foster v. Commissioner of Correction	658
<i>Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of trial counsel; claim that habeas court improperly denied petition for writ of habeas corpus; whether petitioner demonstrated that, but for trial counsel's conduct, he would not have pleaded guilty to underlying crime; whether petitioner proved that he suffered prejudice under Strickland v. Washington (466 U.S. 668); whether habeas court's findings were supported by evidence in record.</i>	
F. T. v. J. T. (Memorandum Decision)	901
Harvin v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	904
Herrera v. Meadow Hill, Inc.	671
<i>Negligence; premises liability; summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motion for summary judgment on basis of ongoing storm doctrine; reviewability of unpreserved claim that evidence submitted by defendants in support of motion for summary judgment did not eliminate all issues of material fact; whether defendants met initial burden to demonstrate no genuine issue of material fact that there was ongoing storm at time of plaintiff's fall or that reasonable time had not elapsed following conclusion of storm within which they should have remediated snowy or icy condition; whether plaintiff met burden to demonstrate genuine issue of fact as to whether allegedly negligent actions of defendants with respect to snow or ice removal caused his fall.</i>	
Houghtaling v. Benevides.	754
<i>Personal injury; action pursuant to statute (§ 22-357) that imposes liability on owner or keeper of dog for harm caused by dog; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in rendering summary judgment because underlying facts did not support court's conclusion that there was no genuine issue of material fact that plaintiff was keeper of dog, precluding her from recovering from defendant under § 22-357; whether, at time of incident, plaintiff exerted degree of care and control over dog similar to that of owner.</i>	
Howard v. Commissioner of Correction	119
<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>	
In re A'vion A.	330
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying respondent mother's motion to compel Department of Children and Families to provide additional reunification services; whether evidence was sufficient to</i>	

support trial court's determination that, pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112 (j) (3) (B)), mother had failed to achieve such degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage belief that, within reasonable time, she could assume responsible position in youngest child's life; mootness; claim that trial court improperly concluded that department had made reasonable efforts at reunification pursuant to § 17a-112 (j) (1); failure of mother to challenge trial court's finding that she was unable or unwilling to benefit from reunification efforts, which was separate independent basis for upholding trial court's determination that requirements of § 17a-112 (j) (1) had been satisfied; whether there was practical relief that could be afforded to mother; whether claim on appeal was moot.

In re Eric M. 809
Termination of parental rights; whether trial court properly determined that interference exception did not apply to preclude petitioner Commissioner of Children and Families from relying on lack of ongoing parent-child relationship ground for termination of parental rights; whether trial court improperly found that respondent father had not achieved sufficient degree of rehabilitation such that he could assume responsible position in life of minor child.

In re Isabella Q. 837
Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court improperly concluded that respondent father was unable or unwilling to benefit from reunification services pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112 (j) (1)); whether, because father failed to challenge on appeal one of two separate and independent bases for upholding trial court's determination that § 17a-112 (j) (1) had been satisfied, father's claim was moot; claim that trial court improperly concluded that father failed to achieve requisite degree of personal rehabilitation required by § 17a-112 (j) (3) (B); claim that trial court improperly concluded that termination of father's parental rights was in best interest of minor child.

In re Jacob W. (Memorandum Decision) 903

In re K. M. 687
Motion for orders regarding therapeutic visitation; motion to suspend paternal visitation; motion to enforce prior existing visitation orders; motion to terminate protective supervision; whether trial court erred in vacating prior visitation orders and entering new visitation orders on basis of erroneous factual findings; whether trial court made erroneous finding that respondent father failed to present evidence of compliance with court-ordered therapy; claim that trial court ignored relationship between children and paternal family in issuing visitation orders; whether trial court properly credited evidence in record to support its determinations regarding best interests of children.

In re Nevaeh G.-M. 854
Termination of parental rights; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support trial court's determination that petitioner Commissioner of Children and Families had proven by clear and convincing evidence that respondent mother had failed to rehabilitate in accordance with applicable statute (§ 17a-112 (j) (3) (B) (i)); claim that trial court made certain evidentiary errors that were harmful, entitling mother to new trial.

Johnson v. Vita Built, LLC 71
Breach of contract; prejudgment remedy; whether trial court improperly granted defendants' application for prejudgment remedy; whether trial court improperly determined that contract unambiguously provided that parties would share only in net profits and not in losses; whether trial court relied on clearly erroneous factual findings in support of alternative conclusion that, even if contract was ambiguous, parol evidence established probable cause that defendants would prevail on their counterclaim.

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. v. Durante (Memorandum Decision) 903

JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Essaghof. 93
Foreclosure; motion to dismiss; claim that trial court improperly construed remand order from Supreme Court in narrow manner; claim that trial court improperly denied defendants' motion to dismiss that claimed court lacked subject matter jurisdiction due to plaintiff's noncompliance with statutory (§ 8-265ee) Emergency Mortgage Assistance Program notice requirements; whether motion to dismiss constituted impermissible collateral attack on judgment of strict foreclosure.

King v. Hubbard 191
Defamation; invasion of privacy; temporary and permanent injunctions; motion to restore case to civil docket; strategic lawsuit against public participation (SLAPP), discussed; special motion to dismiss pursuant to statute (§ 52-196a)

	<i>that affords protection against SLAPP lawsuits; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's motion to restore case to docket after plaintiffs voluntarily withdrew complaint after defendant filed special motion to dismiss; claim that Appellate Court should adopt procedural mechanism to guide trial courts when plaintiff withdraws action in response to special motion to dismiss, including rebuttable presumption that withdrawal filed in response to special motion to dismiss pursuant to § 52-196a was filed to avoid adverse ruling.</i>	
Lastrina v. Bettauer		592
	<i>Medical malpractice; motion for summary judgment; wrongful conduct rule, discussed; whether trial court properly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether sufficient causal nexus existed between conduct by plaintiff's son in purposely deceiving defendants to obtain certification for medical marijuana and son's injuries; whether trial court properly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether conduct of plaintiff's son amounted to serious criminality.</i>	
Lastrina v. Burnham (See Lastrina v. Bettauer)		592
L. D. v. Commissioner of Children & Families.		150
	<i>Administrative appeal; claim that trial court improperly concluded that there was substantial evidence in record to support findings of emotional neglect by plaintiff against his children; whether trial court properly determined that defendant's hearing officer did not act unreasonably, arbitrarily, illegally, or in abuse of her discretion in upholding Department of Children and Families' substantiation of allegations of emotional neglect; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's administrative appeal.</i>	
McGovern v. McGovern.		636
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for continuance filed after trial began in which plaintiff's counsel stated she had suddenly become ill and could not proceed; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to open judgment.</i>	
MEB Loan Trust IV v. Moore (Memorandum Decision)		902
Murphy v. Clinton		182
	<i>Municipal defective highway statute (§ 13a-149); subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court improperly granted defendant's motion to dismiss complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because plaintiff failed to comply with requirements of notice provision in § 13a-149; whether photographs attached to notice should be considered by trial court in its assessment of adequacy of notice under § 13a-149.</i>	
Myshkina v. Gusinski		376
	<i>Breach of contract; motion for default for failure to appear; motion for judgment on default; claim that trial court improperly relied on affidavit of debt signed by plaintiff's counsel in contravention of applicable rule of practice (§ 17-25).</i>	
9 Pettipaug, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission		714
	<i>Zoning; motion for summary judgment; whether trial court properly determined that defendant zoning commission failed to satisfy requirement in statute (§ 8-3 (d)) that notice of its decision regarding zoning amendment be published in newspaper having substantial circulation in municipality; claim that trial court improperly shifted burden of proof regarding satisfaction of substantial circulation component of § 8-3 (d) from plaintiffs to defendant.</i>	
Onyilogwu v. Onyilogwu		647
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; alimony; whether trial court abused its discretion in making excessive award of alimony; whether trial court improperly included plaintiff's temporary COVID-19 pandemic unemployment assistance benefits in its calculation of his income for purposes of determining amount of income available for support purposes in ten year alimony award.</i>	
Prime Management, LLC v. Arthur		737
	<i>Summary process; whether trial court erred in denying defendant's motion to open default judgment; whether trial court erred in denying defendant's amended motion to dismiss; whether trial court incorrectly interpreted executive order issued by governor during public health emergency that placed limitations on evictions in state; whether trial court had subject matter jurisdiction over summary process action.</i>	
Renstrup v. Renstrup		252
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court abused its discretion in calculating child support obligation by failing to allocate properly total amount of child support between parties as required by Child Support and Arrearage Guidelines</i>	

set forth in state regulations (§ 46b-215a-1 et seq.); whether trial court abused its discretion in deviating from child support guidelines in its child support order without making required findings; whether trial court abused its discretion by failing to provide justification for its award of bonus income that was related to financial or nonfinancial needs or characteristics of children pursuant to factors enumerated in statute (§ 46b-84) in ordering supplemental child support order; claim that trial court's supplemental child support and alimony orders were based on clearly erroneous factual finding; whether trial court's supplemental alimony order was severable from other financial orders; whether, on remand, trial court must reconsider all financial orders, including property distribution orders.

Ross v. Commissioner of Correction 286

Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly dismissed habeas petition; whether habeas court erred in rejecting petitioner's claim of actual innocence; claim that evidence need not be newly discovered to establish claim of actual innocence; whether evidence presented at habeas trial undermining credibility of victim's testimony at petitioner's criminal trial by calling into question reliability of surveillance video constituted clear and convincing evidence of petitioner's innocence; claim that habeas court improperly failed to conclude that self-represented petitioner's standby counsel rendered ineffective assistance; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed count of habeas petition alleging that petitioner's rights to due process and assistance of counsel were violated as result of Department of Correction's interception of petitioner's mail containing defense strategy, which thereafter was provided to state's attorney.

Russo v. Thornton 553

Breach of fiduciary duty; aggrievement; application for turnover and charging order; motion to vacate judgment lien and financial institution execution; whether defendant company was aggrieved by trial court's denial of individual defendant's motion to vacate or by court's turnover and charging order; whether trial court correctly concluded that it had rendered final judgment that authorized plaintiffs to seek postjudgment enforcement remedies; claim that trial court's turnover and charging order improperly subjected defendants to injunctive relief; claim that trial court's turnover and charging order improperly continued receivership.

Schimenti Construction Co., LLC v. Schimenti 224

Breach of contract; breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing; summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in granting defendant's motion for summary judgment; whether trial court erred in determining that continued employment of at-will employee did not constitute sufficient consideration for restrictive covenant.

Smorodska v. Commissioner of Correction 171

Habeas corpus; whether habeas court improperly denied petition for writ of habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance in advising petitioner about immigration consequences of plea pursuant to North Carolina v. Alford (400 U.S. 25); claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that trial counsel's advice regarding immigration consequences of plea was unequivocal.

Spring Lake Condominium #5 Assn., Inc. v. Cristiano & Son Painting, LLC (Memorandum Decision) 902

Stanley v. Commissioner of Correction 805

Habeas corpus; failure of petitioner to address threshold question of whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal.

State v. Charles L. 380

Risk of injury to child; claim that there was insufficient evidence presented at trial to convict defendant pursuant to act prong of statute (§ 53-21 (a) (1)); whether direct physical contact with child was required for conviction under act prong of § 53-21 (a) (1) for engaging in conduct likely to impair health of child; claim that § 53-21 (a) (1) was unconstitutionally vague as applied; whether defendant had sufficient notice that his conduct was prohibited by § 53-21 (a) (1).

State v. Billings 1

Criminal violation of restraining order; stalking second degree; harassment second degree; claim that trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence certain social media posts and messages that state allegedly failed to properly authenticate; claim that evidence was insufficient to sustain defendant's convictions of stalking and harassment; whether defendant's stalking and harassment convictions were predicated on speech protected by first amendment; claim that state committed prosecutorial impropriety by failing to comply with certain

	<i>discovery requirements and by making improper statements during its closing argument; claim that trial court abused its discretion when it declined to sanction state for violating court order regarding discovery.</i>	
State v. Foster		476
	<i>Petition seeking continued commitment to jurisdiction of Psychiatric Security Review Board; claim that trial court erred in finding that state met its burden under statute (§ 17a-593) governing continued commitment to board of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that acquittee currently was mentally ill and posed risk of imminent harm to himself or others; whether trial court's focus on safety and well-being of schoolchildren and women in its decision was logically linked to offenses for which acquittee was prosecuted and records of acquittee's confinement; whether evidence before trial court logically supported finding that, if acquittee were to be released from board's supervision entirely, he would risk relapse once outside of present controlled environment; whether trial court improperly rejected acquittee's claim that § 17a-593, as applied to him, violated his right to equal protection guaranteed by federal constitution; whether acquittee was similarly situated to civilly committed inmates for purposes of equal protection analysis.</i>	
State v. Fulgieri (Memorandum Decision)		904
State v. Griffin		358
	<i>Assault of elderly person second degree; claim that defendant was entitled to new trial on charge of assault of elderly person second degree; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to suppress; whether trial court properly relied on automobile exception to fourth amendment's warrant requirement in determining that police were not obligated to obtain warrant before searching defendant's vehicle; whether police had probable cause to search defendant's vehicle.</i>	
State v. Henry		214
	<i>Criminal possession of firearm, ammunition, or electronic defense weapon; motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court erred in denying defendant's motion to correct illegal sentence because sentencing court imposed period of special parole in violation of statute ((Rev. to 2017) § 54-125e (b), as amended by public act (P.A. 18-63)), when it failed to find on record that period of special parole was necessary to ensure public safety; whether certain amendments to § 54-125e (b) embodied in P.A. 18-63 applied retroactively to render defendant's sentence imposing special parole void.</i>	
State v. Hurdle		453
	<i>Robbery first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery first degree; claim that trial court had authority and discretion to award defendant presentence confinement credit pursuant to statute (§ 18-98d) during sentencing proceeding; claim that trial court improperly accepted defendant's guilty pleas and denied motion to withdraw pleas because there was no meeting of minds regarding terms of pleas; unpreserved claim that trial court's plea canvass was constitutionally invalid because defendant was not advised that his guilty pleas would operate as waiver of right to jury trial.</i>	
State v. Sumler		51
	<i>Murder; conspiracy to commit robbery first degree; carrying pistol without permit; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; motion in limine; claim that trial court abused its discretion in admitting witness' testimony identifying defendant in surveillance video and photograph; consideration of four factors set forth in State v. Gore (342 Conn. 129) to determine whether there was some basis for concluding that witness was more likely than jury to correctly identify defendant from surveillance video or photograph.</i>	
Tunick v. Tunick		106
	<i>Breach of fiduciary duty; trusts; unjust enrichment; doctrine of laches; continuing course of conduct doctrine; claim that trial court improperly granted motion to strike count of unjust enrichment on ground that it was time barred by tort statute of limitations (§ 52-577); whether claim of unjust enrichment was equitable claim for relief; whether genuine issues of material fact existed as to whether § 52-577 was tolled by operation of continuing course of conduct doctrine; whether plaintiff established existence of genuine issue of material fact as to whether defendant committed continuous breach of fiduciary duty owed to remainder beneficiaries that resulted in enhanced injury to plaintiff.</i>	