

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 219

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

<p>ARVYS Protein, Inc. v. A/F Protein, Inc.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Arbitration; whether trial court improperly denied plaintiff's application to modify or vacate arbitration award; claim that arbitrator's award exceeded scope of submission by awarding noncontractual relief; claim that arbitrator manifestly disregarded law by ignoring undisputed contract provisions limiting damages and disclaiming warranties; claim that award violated public policy because it arose from unauthorized practice of law.</i></p> <p>C. M. v. R. M.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Dissolution of marriage; postdissolution motion to relocate; subject matter jurisdiction; whether defendant was aggrieved by judgment of trial court granting his motion to relocate pursuant to statute (§ 46b-56d).</i></p> <p>Francis v. CIT Bank, N.A.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Entry and detainer; motion to open judgment of nonsuit; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's motion to open judgment after granting defendants' motion for nonsuit.</i></p> <p>Napolitano v. Ace American Ins. Co.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Workers' compensation; declaratory judgment; breach of contract; motion for summary judgment; motion to strike; whether trial court erred in granting plaintiff employer's motion for summary judgment on grounds that court improperly determined that defendant insurer's notice of cancellation of workers' compensation insurance policy was ineffective and that defendant breached its duty to defend or indemnify plaintiff under policy; claim that defendant's notice of cancellation of workers' compensation insurance policy pursuant to statute (§ 31-348) was effective because it was certain and unequivocal as required by § 31-348 and Dengler v. Special Attention Health Services, Inc. (62 Conn. App. 440); whether trial court erred in granting defendant's motion to strike claim asserting bad faith.</i></p> <p>O'Reggio v. Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Employment discrimination; claim that trial court erred in affirming administrative decision of defendant Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities; whether defendant employer was liable to plaintiff under Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act (CFEPA) ((Rev. to 2015) § 46a-51 et seq.) for claim of hostile work environment created by one of its employees; whether definition of "supervisor" adopted by United States Supreme Court in Vance v. Ball State University (570 U.S. 421) for purposes of Title VII of Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq.) applied to hostile work environment claims brought under CFEPA.</i></p> <p>Stanziale v. Hunt.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Negligence; contributory negligence; general verdict rule; whether general verdict rule barred this court from reviewing plaintiff motorcyclist's claims on appeal regarding contested evidence of speed at which motorcycle was traveling and length of its skid mark at time of accident; whether contested evidence was relevant to both grounds on which jury could have based its general verdict for defendants, defendants' denial of plaintiff's claim of negligence and defendants' special defense of comparative negligence; claim that trial court improperly denied plaintiff's motion in limine to redact from his medical records all references to speed at which motorcycle had been traveling at time of accident; claim that defendants had burden of establishing that statements in plaintiff's medical records about speed at which motorcycle had been traveling were admissible under applicable exception to rule against hearsay; claim that trial court improperly permitted defendant husband of motor vehicle operator to testify about length of skid mark where husband had measured skid mark three hours after accident occurred.</i></p> <p>State v. DeCosta.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Interfering with officer; claim that trial court improperly failed to advise defendant during its plea canvass that, by pleading guilty, defendant was waiving right</i></p>	<p>20</p> <p>57</p> <p>139</p> <p>110</p> <p>1</p> <p>71</p> <p>137</p>
---	---

to jury trial; whether defendant's payment of fine imposed by trial court during sentencing required dismissal of appeal pursuant to statute (§ 54-96a).

State v. Santiago 44

Motion to correct illegal sentence; mootness; motion to dismiss; postappeal motion for sentence modification; whether consideration of claims on appeal would result in practical relief to defendant in light of sentence modification granted by trial court during pendency of appeal; whether trial court's ruling on appeal dismissing motion to correct had been superseded during pendency of appeal by sentence modification.