

**Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 218**

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Bank of New York Mellon v. Fisher (Memorandum Decision)	903
Bank of New York Mellon v. Gaetano (Memorandum Decision)	907
Bradley v. Yovino	1
<i>Breach of contract; summary judgment; motion for protective order; motion to compel; motion for extension of time; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's motion to compel second round of depositions of certain of defendant's employees and motion for extension of time to respond to motion for summary judgment; whether plaintiff was harmed by inability to further depose certain of defendant's employees; claim that trial court erred by granting defendant's motion for summary judgment without hearing oral argument on motion pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 11-18); whether trial court's failure to provide oral argument on defendant's motion for summary judgment constituted reversible error; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's motion to reargue in light of its granting of second plaintiff's motion to reargue, despite both motions having same legal arguments.</i>	
Braasch v. Freedom of Information Commission	488
<i>Administrative appeal; alleged violation of Freedom of Information Act (§ 1-200 et seq.); whether trial court properly concluded that certain body camera recordings created by defendant university police department were exempt from disclosure pursuant to statute (§ 1-210 (b) (3) (H)) because they were records containing uncorroborated allegations subject to destruction pursuant to statute (§ 1-216); claim that defendant Freedom of Information Commission improperly based its application of § 1-210 (b) (3) (H) on erroneous finding that plaintiff made uncorroborated allegations of criminal activity; claim that commission improperly determined that § 1-210 (b) (3) (H) applied even though recordings were made available to dean of university; whether commission arbitrarily refused to require department and assistant chief of department to provide plaintiff with redacted recordings; whether trial court properly granted motion to seal recordings.</i>	
Brewer v. Commissioner of Correction.	281
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner's appeal was moot; 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; adoption of reasoning and conclusion set forth in <i>Leffingwell v. Commissioner of Correction</i> (218 Conn. App. 216) in resolving issues and regarding remand order.</i>	
C. D. v. C. D.	818
<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court's judgment dissolving parties' marriage was inconsistent with court's subsequent articulations of that decision; claim that defendant was deprived of notice and meaningful opportunity to be heard when trial court articulated that it relied on its pretrial observations of parties when rendering judgment; claim that trial court incorrectly relied on plaintiff's receipt of pretrial payments from defendant in entering alimony orders; whether trial court's factual findings concerning incident between parties that resulted in defendant's arrest were clearly erroneous; claim that trial court improperly limited defendant's visitation with parties' minor children; whether trial court improperly delegated its judicial authority to nonjudicial entities in violation of statute (§ 46b-56 (g)) when it authorized children's therapeutic counselors to determine whether to afford defendant access to children's private therapy records; whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering defendant to pay child support to plaintiff without first determining presumptive support amount as required by regulations (§ 46b-215a-1 et seq.) governing child support.</i>	
Centrix Management Co., LLC v. Fosberg	206
<i>Summary process; motion for attorney's fees pursuant to statute (§ 42-150bb); motion to dismiss appeal as untimely; subject matter jurisdiction; whether this</i>	

<i>court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's appeal; whether five day appeal period set forth in statute (§ 47a-35) that pertains to appeals in summary process actions or twenty day appeal period set forth in applicable rule of practice (§ 63-1) applied to plaintiff's appeal from trial court's award of attorney's fees; whether five day appeal period set forth in § 47a-35 applies to postjudgment award of attorney's fees pursuant to § 42-150bb in summary process context.</i>	
Cortes v. Cortes (Memorandum Decision)	904
Crump v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	902
Day v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	907
Deutsche Bank Trust Co. Americas v. Burke	542
<i>Foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly rejected defendants' special defense of laches; whether trial court properly found that plaintiff's delay in prosecuting action was not inexcusable; whether trial court improperly placed burden on defendants to prove defense of laches.</i>	
Doe v. Quinnipiac University.	170
<i>Negligence; mootness; motion to dismiss; whether plaintiff's action could be saved by applicable statutes (§§ 52-592 and 52-593); whether, because plaintiff did not challenge on appeal every independent basis on which trial court relied in granting defendants' motions to dismiss, plaintiff's appeal was moot.</i>	
Fine v. Lamb (Memorandum Decision)	902
Fitzgerald v. Bridgeport.	771
<i>Declaratory judgment; mootness; vacatur; whether trial court erred in concluding that defendants did not follow proper civil service procedures pursuant to city charter in promoting defendant police captain to assistant police chief position; whether defendant's retirement from position of assistant police chief rendered appeal moot as there was no practical relief available to plaintiffs; whether vacatur of trial court's judgment was warranted under circumstances of case.</i>	
Gaudett v. Bridgeport Police Dept.	720
<i>Statutory (§ 7-433c) benefits for hypertension or heart disease; workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner dismissing plaintiff employee's claim for benefits under § 7-433c; whether plaintiff's employment with defendant police department began on or after July 1, 1996; whether plaintiff's appointment as chief of police constituted new date of hire rendering him ineligible for benefits pursuant to § 7-433c (b); whether plaintiff's pension status was factor in determining eligibility for benefits under § 7-433c.</i>	
Gregory v. Commissioner of Correction	635
<i>Habeas corpus; summary judgment; claim by respondent Commissioner of Correction that habeas court improperly rendered summary judgment for petitioner on count of his habeas petition alleging that trial court's failure to instruct jury pursuant to State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509) with respect to petitioner's kidnapping convictions violated state and federal constitutions; claim that habeas court improperly rendered summary judgment for respondent on count of habeas petition alleging that petitioner's nolo contendere pleas to kidnapping and other offenses made in two cases prior to decision in Salamon were not made knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily; whether Salamon should have been applied retroactively to undo petitioner's negotiated plea agreement.</i>	
Inkel v. Superior Court (Memorandum Decision)	902
In re Amanda C.	731
<i>Termination of parental rights; Interstate Compact on Placement of Children (§ 17a-175); whether trial court properly determined that § 17a-175 did not apply when guardianship of minor children was transferred to out-of-state father and paternal aunt was appointed as coguardian.</i>	
In re Anthony S.	127
<i>Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court improperly determined that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts toward reunification of respondent mother and minor child; claim that trial court improperly determined that mother had failed to rehabilitate in accordance with applicable statute (§ 17a-112 (j) (3) (B) (i)); claim that trial court improperly determined that termination of mother's parental rights was in best interest of child.</i>	
In re Autumn O.	424
<i>Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court improperly determined that respondent mother was unable or unwilling to benefit from reunification services; whether mother's failure to challenge trial court's determination as to each of two independent bases for satisfying statute (§ 17a-112 (j) (1)) rendered claim</i>	

moot; claim that trial court improperly determined that mother had failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation required by § 17a-112 (j) (3) (B); claim that trial court improperly determined that it was in best interests of minor children to terminate mother's parental rights.

In re Kharm A. 750

Termination of parental rights; mootness; claim that trial court erroneously concluded that Department of Children and Families had made reasonable efforts to reunify respondent mother with minor child pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112 (j) (1)); whether, because mother 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, mother's claim was moot.

In re Kylie P. 85

Termination of parental rights; whether trial court erred in concluding that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify respondent mother with minor child; claim that trial court erred in finding that department was not required to make reasonable efforts to reunify mother with child pursuant to statute (§ 17a-111b (a) (2)); whether evidence was sufficient to support trial court's finding that mother had not achieved requisite degree of rehabilitation to assume responsible position in child's life; claim that trial court was precluded from finding mother had failed to rehabilitate because department improperly interfered with her parent-child relationship; whether mother could prevail on her unreserved claim that trial court violated her right to due process in asking child's attorney to call witness after close of evidence.

Kelly v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services 445

Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner determining that plaintiff, as per diem employee, was not entitled to statutory (§ 5-142 (a)) enhanced, full salary disability benefits; claim that board erred in upholding commissioner's decision because commissioner improperly relied on certain exhibit as substantive evidence; claim that commissioner failed to allocate to defendant Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services burden of proving plaintiff was not entitled to enhanced benefits of § 5-142 (a); claim that board improperly upheld commissioner's conclusion that 1989 memorandum of agreement between state and plaintiff's union superseded § 5-142 (a); claim that commissioner's analysis was inconsistent as to whether enhanced benefits of § 5-142 (a) were denied to per diem employees pursuant to 1993 collective bargaining agreement; claim that board erred in upholding commissioner's decision because commissioner improperly held that 1993 collective bargaining agreement was not required to go through new supersedence process pursuant to statute (§ 5-278).

Leffingwell v. Commissioner of Correction 216

Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner's appeal was moot; 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.]

Lobsenz v. Lobsenz (Memorandum Decision) 901

Long Manor Owners' Assn., Inc. v. Alungbe 415

Foreclosure; whether trial court improperly denied defendant opportunity to testify and to present evidence to support his defense when defendant's connection to remote proceeding was temporarily disrupted; unreserved claim that trial court erred in appointing receiver of rents; claim that trial court erred in awarding plaintiff amount of debt and other fees; claim that trial court erred in failing to consider all of defendant's testimony and evidence presented during trial; claim that trial court erred in denying defendant's motion to reargue.

Mitchell v. Bogonos 59

Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court abused its discretion in refusing to address defendant's motion for contempt; claim that trial court abused its discretion in failing to grant defendant's motion for contempt and award her attorney's fees; whether trial court erred in awarding asset to plaintiff without hearing evidence of its appraised value; whether trial court erred in failing to impute income of \$150,000 to plaintiff; whether trial court made ruling that defendant committed fraud in submission of application for asylum.

Momtaz v. Chowdhury (Memorandum Decision)	907
Murchison v. Waterbury	396
<i>Breach of contract; collective bargaining; summary judgment; whether trial court improperly found that plaintiff firefighters, formerly employed by defendant city, were entitled to terminal leave pay for accumulated and unused sick time under city's collective bargaining agreement with plaintiffs' union when undefined term retirement in agreement was ambiguous and court failed to resolve that ambiguity; claim that plaintiffs were ineligible for terminal leave pay because they resigned from employment, rather than retired, for purposes of terminal leave pay provision of agreement; claim that trial court improperly applied contra proferentem rule to resolve ambiguous nature of word retirement in terminal leave pay provision against city when there was no extrinsic evidence before court that city had drafted agreement.</i>	
Norwich v. Brenton Family Trust (Memorandum Decision)	905
Nova Management, LLC v. Coty (Memorandum Decision)	901
Nowak v. Environmental Energy Services, Inc.	516
<i>Petition for bill of discovery; subject matter jurisdiction; mootness; claim that trial court improperly determined that plaintiff met burden of establishing probable cause to bring claims against defendants for corporate misconduct; claim that trial court improperly determined that plaintiff had no means other than bill of discovery to discover majority of records she requested from defendants; claim that discovery proceedings in separate civil action brought by defendants rendered plaintiff's petition for bill of discovery moot, implicating this court's subject matter jurisdiction; claim that judgment on petition for bill of discovery was rendered moot by plaintiff's filing of counterclaim in defendants' civil action that asserted same three counts for which she claimed need for discovery in petition for bill of discovery.</i>	
Pascarella v. Silver	326
<i>Declaratory judgment; claim that trial court improperly concluded that doctrine of res judicata did not apply to facts of case; whether plaintiffs' res judicata claim was enforcement action; whether res judicata barred defendant from asserting counterclaim relating to alleged breach of contract.</i>	
Sacramone v. Harlow, Adams & Friedman, P.C.	288
<i>Probate appeal; attorney's fees; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that Superior Court improperly vacated decree awarding attorney's fees; claim that Probate Court's first decree was not final decree pursuant to statute (§ 45a-24); whether Superior Court properly concluded that Probate Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction to award attorney's fees after disallowing fees in prior decree; whether Probate Court properly had subject matter jurisdiction to reconsider its decision on issue of legal fees pursuant to statute (§ 45a-128 (b)).</i>	
Smith v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	904
Stamford Property Holdings, LLC v. Jashari	179
<i>Leases; contract reformation; mootness; claim that trial court improperly granted reformation of contract based on unilateral mistake; whether defendants' failure to challenge trial court's alternative ground for reformation rendered portion of appeal moot; claim that trial court improperly granted plaintiff equitable relief because plaintiff's allegedly reckless misconduct prior to execution of lease barred its claim for reformation.</i>	
Stanley v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	905
Stanley v. East Hartford (Memorandum Decision)	903
Stanley v. Leclerc (Memorandum Decision)	906
Stanley v. Macchiarulo (Memorandum Decision)	905
Stanley v. Quiros (Memorandum Decision)	906
State v. Armstrong	31
<i>Attempt to commit robbery first degree; sufficiency of evidence; claim that state failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt that defendant was guilty of attempted robbery; whether evidence was sufficient to support finding that defendant displayed or threatened use of what he represented by his words or conduct to be firearm.</i>	
State v. Delacruz-Gomez	260
<i>Assault of public safety personnel; interfering with officer; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting as uncharged misconduct evidence testimony of police officers identifying names of crimes contained in arrest warrant officers executed at defendant's apartment; claim that evidence of names of crimes was more prejudicial than probative; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting</i>	

as uncharged misconduct evidence identity and purpose of entity that executed warrant for defendant's arrest; claim that evidence of identity and purpose of entity that executed arrest warrant was more prejudicial than probative.

State v. Eric L. 302
Violation of probation; claim that trial court erred in finding that defendant violated his probation; whether any one of four grounds state alleged for violation of probation constituted independent ground to find that defendant violated his probation; claim that trial court abused its discretion when it revoked defendant's probation and imposed sentence that included period of incarceration; claim that trial court abused its discretion in failing to award defendant presentence confinement credit for certain period of pretrial confinement; whether Commissioner of Correction has sole statutory (§ 18-98d) authority to determine defendant's eligibility for presentence confinement credit and to apply such credit against defendant's sentence.

State v. Orane C. 683
Sexual assault first degree; motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly denied defendant's motion to dismiss count of substitute information charging aggravated first degree sexual assault as time barred by statute of limitations ((Rev. to 2019) § 54-193 (b)); analysis of substitute information under factors set forth in State v. Golodner (305 Conn. 330) to determine whether statute of limitations was tolled; claim that trial court erred in admitting recording of phone conversation to which defendant was party in violation of statutes (§§ 52-570d and 52-184a); unpreserved claim that trial court's limitation of defense counsel's closing arguments regarding victim's credibility violated defendant's constitutional rights to summation and effective assistance of counsel.

State v. Perez-Lopez. 555
Assault first degree; eyewitness identification; whether trial court violated defendant's state constitutional right to due process by denying his motion to suppress victim's out-of-court identification after failing to apply burden shifting analysis set forth in State v. Harris (330 Conn. 91); claim that trial court abused its discretion by denying defendant's motion in limine to preclude victim's identification of him following photo lineup; whether trial court abused its discretion and violated defendant's right to present defense by denying his specific request to charge jury on eyewitness identification.

State v. Orane C. 683
Sexual assault first degree; motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly denied defendant's motion to dismiss count of substitute information charging aggravated first degree sexual assault as time barred by statute of limitations ((Rev. to 2019) § 54-193 (b)); analysis of substitute information under factors set forth in State v. Golodner (305 Conn. 330) to determine whether statute of limitations was tolled; claim that trial court erred in admitting recording of phone conversation to which defendant was party in violation of statutes (§§ 52-570d and 52-184a); unpreserved claim that trial court's limitation of defense counsel's closing arguments regarding victim's credibility violated defendant's constitutional rights to summation and effective assistance of counsel.

State v. Perez-Lopez. 555
Assault first degree; eyewitness identification; whether trial court violated defendant's state constitutional right to due process by denying his motion to suppress victim's out-of-court identification after failing to apply burden shifting analysis set forth in State v. Harris (330 Conn. 91); claim that trial court abused its discretion by denying defendant's motion in limine to preclude victim's identification of him following photo lineup; whether trial court abused its discretion and violated defendant's right to present defense by denying his specific request to charge jury on eyewitness identification.

Stewart v. Old Republic National Title Ins. Co. 226
Insurance; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment filed by defendant title insurance company with respect to its duty to defend or indemnify plaintiffs in two actions involving plaintiffs' properties; claim that trial court improperly determined that there were no genuine issues of material fact that claims for which plaintiffs sought coverage were excluded from coverage under title insurance policies issued by defendant; whether trial court improperly determined that defendant had no duty to defend or indemnify plaintiffs in their respective actions regarding their properties; claim that complaint brought against plaintiff limited liability company alleged that it did not have exclusive ownership of private portion of street,

	<i>thereby challenging its title to that property; whether town's acquisition of property containing abandoned cemetery, pursuant to statute (§ 19a-308a), was exercise of governmental police power and constituted acquisition by condemnation, expressly excluding such taking from coverage under individual plaintiffs' policy.</i>	
Taylor v. Planning & Zoning Commission		616
	<i>Zoning; application for site plan and special excavation and fill permit; certified appeal to Appellate Court; whether trial court improperly concluded that defendant planning and zoning commission did not deprive plaintiff of his right to fundamental fairness by preventing him from being heard on whether his application was sufficiently complete such that it should be adjudicated on its merits.</i>	
Thunelius v. Posacki (Memorandum Decision)		901
Torres v. State		854
	<i>Petition for new trial; motion to dismiss; whether habeas court improperly dismissed petitioner's amended petition for new trial.</i>	
Trakhtenberg v. Trakhtenberg (Memorandum Decision)		903
Trejo v. Yale New Haven Hospital, Inc.		781
	<i>Employment discrimination; motion for summary judgment; whether trial court erred in granting defendant's motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in concluding that there were no genuine issues of material fact regarding plaintiff's claims of gender and sexual orientation discrimination and retaliation; whether defendant's legitimate, nondiscriminatory justification for plaintiff's discharge was pretext for unlawful discrimination; whether there was any evidence that plaintiff engaged in protected activity giving rise to claim of retaliation prior to termination of employment; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and analysis of applicable law on issues.</i>	
V. V. v. V. V.		157
	<i>Application for relief from abuse; claim that trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction because plaintiff father did not have standing to apply for restraining order as next friend of minor child.</i>	
Wells Fargo Bank, National Assn. v. Doreus.		77
	<i>Foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment of strict foreclosure because doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel barred action when prior foreclosure action plaintiff filed against same defendant as to same property had been dismissed for failure to prosecute pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 14-3 (a)).</i>	
Wells Fargo Bank, National Assn. v. Rattet (Memorandum Decision)		906
White v. Waterbury Fire Dept.		711
	<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner that injuries plaintiff firefighter sustained when he fell leaving his home while carrying work gear to work overtime shift were not compensable; claim that bringing work gear home was mutually beneficial to plaintiff and defendant and was not, pursuant to statute (§ 31-275 (1) (E)), preliminary act incidental to employment.</i>	
Wihbey v. Zoning Board of Appeals.		356
	<i>Zoning; whether trial court properly determined that short-term rental of single-family dwelling was lawful under zoning regulations in place when plaintiff purchased property and rental activity began; claim that trial court improperly determined that plaintiff had established lawful nonconforming use of property where record indicated that defendant zoning board of appeals made no factual findings on that issue.</i>	
Woermer v. Prudential Ins. Co. of America (Memorandum Decision)		904
Wolfel v. Wolfel		760
	<i>Probate appeal; claim that Superior Court exceeded its authority by addressing issues that plaintiffs did not raise in appeal from decree of Probate Court; whether Superior Court erred in finding that plaintiffs failed to prove that payments made into trust account were sufficient to cure self-dealing distributions made to certain plaintiff from trust.</i>	
Worth v. Picard		549
	<i>Negligence; summary process execution; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly concluded as matter of law that plaintiff's claims were barred by absolute immunity pursuant to litigation privilege; whether plaintiff's appeal was moot; whether plaintiff failed to challenge every independent basis on which trial court granted defendant's motion for summary judgment.</i>	