

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>Commissioner of Transportation v. Chudy</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Condemnation; notice of condemnation and assessment of damages filed by plaintiff pursuant to statute (§13a-73 (b)) for partial taking of certain of defendants' real property; application seeking reassessment of damages pursuant to statute (§ 13a-76) filed in connection with partial taking of defendants' real property; credibility of expert witnesses; whether trial court erred by failing to award severance damages to defendants as of date of taking; whether trial court's determination that defendants failed to prove that their property was landlocked on date of taking was clearly erroneous.</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>In re Cameron H.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court improperly concluded that respondent mother was unable or unwilling to benefit from reunification services provided to her pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112); claim that there was insufficient evidence for trial court to conclude that mother was unable or unwilling to benefit from reunification services; whether trial court properly determined that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify mother with her children; claim that department's services provided to mother were inadequate given complex needs of children; claim that trial court improperly determined that mother failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage belief that, within reasonable time, considering age and needs of children, she could assume responsible position in their lives as required by § 17a-112 (j) (3) (B) (ii).</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</i></p>	<p>20</p> <p>57</p> <p>202</p> <p>139</p> <p>149</p> <p>110</p> <p>1</p>
---	--

	<i>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 CFEPFA.</i>	
Stanziale v. Hunt		71
	<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>	
State v. DeCosta		137
	<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 to jury trial; whether defendant’s payment of fine imposed by trial court during sentencing required dismissal of appeal pursuant to statute (§ 54-96a).</i>	
State v. Santiago		44
	<i>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.</i>	
Young v. Commissioner of Correction		171
	<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly concluded that state had not violated petitioner’s right to due process under Brady v. Maryland (373 U.S. 83) by failing to disclose agreement under which witness agreed to testify truthfully against him at his criminal trial in exchange for state’s agreement to inform sentencing court in witness’ criminal case of her testimony and cooperation; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner had failed to establish that witness’ testimony at petitioner’s criminal trial was false or substantially misleading and that prosecutor failed to correct it in violation of his due process rights.</i>	