

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 220

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

A. D. v. L. D.	172
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion to modify custody and visitation; claim that trial court violated defendant's fundamental right to family integrity as guaranteed under federal constitution; claim that trial court created near impossibility that defendant could ever regain visitation with his children; claim that trial court violated defendant's federal due process rights by applying incorrect burden of proof in considering plaintiff's motion to modify custody.</i>	
Altavista Investments, LLC v. Makeeva (Memorandum Decision).	901
Ammar I. v. Dept. of Children & Families	77
<i>Religious discrimination; motion to dismiss; motion to reargue; litigation privilege; claim that trial court erred in concluding that litigation privilege did not bar plaintiff's discrimination claims; whether plaintiff's claims were akin to claims for vexatious litigation and abuse of process; claim that there were public policy reasons for not applying litigation privilege to plaintiff's claims of discrimination.</i>	
Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC v. Ishikawa	625
<i>Foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for strict foreclosure as to liability only; claim that receipt of notice as to all defendants was condition precedent to bringing foreclosure action; claim that complaint failed to allege that notice of default and acceleration had been provided to all defendants, as required by federal regulation (24 C.F.R. § 201.50).</i>	
Belgada v. Hy's Livery Service, Inc.	102
<i>Unpaid wages; summary judgment; whether trial court, in granting defendants' motion for summary judgment, properly determined that plaintiff chauffeurs' meal breaks did not constitute compensable hours worked under applicable minimum wage law (§ 31-76b (2) (A)); whether trial court properly determined that defendants' meal break policy did not give rise to enforceable contract with plaintiffs; claim that defendants incorporated into written meal break policy completely relieved from duty test under applicable federal regulation (§ 29 C.F.R. 785.19) governing federal overtime law; whether trial court properly analyzed issue of whether meal breaks were predominantly for plaintiffs' own benefit under predominant benefit test adopted by majority of federal courts of appeals in determining that meal breaks were not compensable under § 31-76b (2) (A); claim that meal breaks constituted hours worked under plain language of § 31-76b (2) (A) because plaintiffs were required to guard limousines and remain within two miles of next pickup location; whether genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether meal breaks were predominantly for plaintiffs' benefit.</i>	
Brownstone Exploration & Discovery Park, LLC v. Borodkin.	806
<i>Arbitration; claim that trial court improperly denied plaintiff's application to compel arbitration; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that question of arbitrability was not expressly reserved to arbitrators and erroneously made arbitrability determination itself; claim that trial court incorrectly denied application to compel arbitration on procedural grounds without first providing parties with opportunity to address procedural issue.</i>	
Cazenovia Creek Funding I, LLC v. White Eagle Society of Brotherly Help, Inc., Group 315, Polish National Alliance.	770
<i>Foreclosure of municipal tax liens; whether trial court properly granted motion for summary judgment as to liability only for plaintiff; claim that trial court improperly concluded that tax liens were properly assigned to plaintiff; whether trial court's determination of debt due to plaintiff was clearly erroneous.</i>	
Cochran v. Dept. of Transportation	855
<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner awarding plaintiff temporary total disability benefits pursuant to statute (§ 31-307 (a)); whether plaintiff's injury resulted in total incapacity to work; whether plaintiff was entitled to § 31-</i>	

	<i>307 (a) benefits more than ten years after he took voluntary early retirement and never intended to reenter workforce.</i>	
Cornelius v. Markle Investigations, Inc.		135
	<i>Invasion of privacy by intrusion upon seclusion; motions for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment for defendants; whether genuine issues of material fact existed as to whether defendants' surveillance of plaintiff in public was actionable intrusion and was highly offensive to reasonable person.</i>	
Crocker v. Commissioner of Correction		567
	<i>Habeas corpus; claim that counsel in two previous habeas actions provided ineffective assistance by failing to raise claims that criminal trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance; whether petitioner met burden of demonstrating deficient performance by trial counsel in failing to conduct reasonable pretrial investigation to uncover potentially exculpatory witnesses; whether petitioner met burden of demonstrating deficient performance by trial counsel in failing to call certain allegedly exculpatory witnesses to testify at criminal trial; whether trial counsel could have identified certain witnesses in course of reasonably competent investigation; whether there were objectively reasonable strategic reasons why trial counsel did not call certain witnesses.</i>	
Curley v. Phoenix Ins. Co.		732
	<i>Underinsured motorist benefits; motion for summary judgment; motion to reargue; reviewability of plaintiff's claims regarding application of statute (§ 38a-336) and certain endorsement to commercial automobile liability insurance policy, which were raised for first time in plaintiff's motion to reargue; whether trial court improperly rendered summary judgment for defendant insurance company; whether plaintiff was insured under her employer's policy for purposes of liability coverage; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact that plaintiff was not entitled to underinsured motorist benefits pursuant to § 38a-336.</i>	
Drewnowski v. Planning & Zoning Commission.		430
	<i>Administrative appeal; special permit and subdivision applications for flexible residential development; claim that Superior Court improperly determined that length of proposed dead-end access road for new flexible residential development exceeded maximum length prescribed by applicable subdivision regulation of town of Suffield (§ 905 (c)); whether language in applicable zoning regulation of town of Suffield (§ VI (B)) superseded street length limitation in § 905 of subdivision regulations; whether existing dead-end street that would connect to proposed dead-end access road could be considered "connecting street" under § 905 of subdivision regulations for purposes of measuring length of proposed road; claim that approval of defendant developer's applications by defendant planning and zoning commission was independently authorized pursuant to applicable subdivision regulations (§§ 902 and 905 (a)).</i>	
Elwell v. Kellogg.		822
	<i>Vexatious litigation; motion to strike; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in denying plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on basis of its conclusion that collateral estoppel did not apply so as to establish lack of probable cause; whether trial court's decision issued in foreclosure action while automatic bankruptcy stay was in effect was void; claim that trial court erred in rendering summary judgment for defendant on claim for vexatious litigation because it did not bifurcate issue of probable cause; whether trial court was required to hold separate evidentiary hearing on probable cause pursuant to Falls Church Group, Ltd. v. Tyler, Cooper & Alcorn, LLP (281 Conn. 84); claim that trial court erred in granting defendant's motion to strike claim alleging violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); whether plaintiff pleaded sufficient facts to allege that defendant engaged in deceptive acts or practices concerning entrepreneurial aspects of practice of law.</i>	
Haydusky's Appeal from Probate		267
	<i>Probate appeal; subject matter jurisdiction; motion to dismiss; application for reconsideration; whether Superior Court properly determined that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over appeal from Probate Court order overruling plaintiff's objection to retention of certain law firm on behalf of estate on basis that appeal was untimely pursuant to statute (§ 45a-186 (b)); whether plaintiff appealed from Probate Court's denial of application for reconsideration; claim that thirty day appeal period set forth in § 45a-186 (b) was tolled by plaintiff's filing of application for reconsideration.</i>	

In re Caiden B. 326
Termination of parental rights; whether evidence was sufficient to support trial court's conclusion that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify respondent father with his minor children; claim that trial court's finding that department facilitated adequate visitation with children was clearly erroneous; claim that department was required to seek court order to compel father to comply with referrals for therapy; claim that parenting education services department offered were inadequate; claim that trial court erroneously determined that father had failed to achieve degree of rehabilitation such as would encourage belief that, within reasonable time, he could assume responsible position in children's lives; claim that trial court improperly concluded that termination of father's parental rights was in children's best interests.

In re Deboras S. 1
Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court improperly concluded that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify children with respondent mother; claim that trial court improperly concluded that mother failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112); whether trial court erroneously found that termination of parental rights was in best interests of children; claim that trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction to terminate mother's parental rights due to its failure to join maternal grandmother, who was children's primary caregiver, as party; whether trial court improperly precluded grandmother from participating as party in termination trial; whether trial court applied proper legal standard in adjudicating grandmother's motion to transfer guardianship; claim that trial court violated grandmother's right to equal protection.

In re Fayth C. 315
Termination of parental rights; whether trial court erred in finding that respondent father had failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation, and, in making that determination, applied incorrect legal standard.

In re Kyreese L. 705
Termination of parental rights; claim that 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 concluding that mother failed to achieve such degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage belief that she could assume responsible position in life of minor child; whether this court needed to determine if mother was unable or unwilling to benefit from reunification services.

In re L. T. 680
Termination of parental rights; whether trial court properly found that Department of Children and Families made reasonable efforts to reunify respondent mother with minor children and that she was unable or unwilling to benefit from such efforts; claim that trial court improperly determined that mother had failed to achieve such degree of rehabilitation as would encourage belief that, within reasonable time, she could assume responsible position in children's lives; claim that trial court improperly denied mother's motion for posttermination visitation.

In re Ryan C. 507
Child neglect; motion to intervene; motion to revoke commitment; motion to transfer guardianship; whether trial court improperly granted foster parent's motions to intervene pursuant to rule of practice (§ 35a-4) applicable to hearings concerning neglected children and to transfer guardianship of respondent father's minor child to herself; whether trial court abused its discretion by precluding evidence pertaining to mental health and behavior of child's sister as well as care provided to sister by father and paternal grandparents; termination of stay of execution pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 71-6).

In re Serenity W. 380
Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that respondent mother failed to rehabilitate sufficiently to assume responsible position in minor child's life, within reasonable time, pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112 (j) (3) (B) (i) and (E)); claim that trial court could not reasonably have concluded that mother failed to rehabilitate in light of fact that mother's younger child remained in her care.

Lafferty v. Jones. 724
Writ of error; motion to dismiss; claim that writ of error should be dismissed on ground that defendant in error was misjoined party; whether writ of error had

	<i>been served in timely manner; whether writ of error should be dismissed as to defendant in error for lack of proper service of process.</i>	
Lowthert v. Freedom of Information Commission		48
	<i>Administrative appeal; alleged violation of open meeting requirements of provision (§ 1-225 (a)) of Freedom of Information Act (§ 1-200 et seq.) by defendant Freedom of Information Commission and/or its staff; reviewability of plaintiff's unpreserved claim that trial court erred in denying plaintiff's application for order requiring commission to hold hearing on plaintiff's complaint because commission and its executive director had conflict of interest in violation of statute (§ 1-85).</i>	
Marrero v. Hoffman of Simsbury, Inc.		649
	<i>Wrongful discharge; claim that trial court erred in rendering summary judgment for defendant; whether plaintiff established prima facie cases of pregnancy and gender discrimination; whether plaintiff presented evidence sufficient to demonstrate existence of genuine issue of material fact as to whether defendant's purported nondiscriminatory justification for terminating plaintiff's employment was pretext for unlawful discrimination.</i>	
Martinoli v. Stamford Police Dept.		874
	<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner awarding plaintiff temporary total disability benefits pursuant to statute (§ 31-307 (a)); claim that commissioner erred in determining that plaintiff was entitled to such benefits when plaintiff had voluntarily retired and had no intention of returning to workforce; analysis set forth in decision in Cochran v. Dept. of Transportation (220 Conn. App. 855), dispositive of appeal.</i>	
Mirlis v. Yeshiva of New Haven, Inc.		60
	<i>Foreclosure of judgment lien; motion to open judgment of strict foreclosure; motion to reargue; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's renewed motion to open judgment of strict foreclosure; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's motion to reargue.</i>	
Morales v. Commissioner of Correction		285
	<i>Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner failed to properly preserve habeas claim for appellate review; claim that habeas court incorrectly concluded that trial counsel did not provide ineffective assistance by failing to abandon theory of self-defense after petitioner testified that gun he was holding discharged by accident in causing victim's death, thus negating viability of theory of self-defense.</i>	
Netter v. Netter		491
	<i>Dissolution of Marriage; pendente lite motion for access to former marital residence to retrieve personal belongings; motion for contempt; claim that trial court improperly issued order permitting plaintiff to access former marital residence; whether, even if defendant's claim regarding pendente lite motion was moot following issuance of final orders, it was subject to appellate review under capable of repetition, yet evading review exception to mootness doctrine; claim that trial court improperly found defendant in contempt for violating certain provision of parenting plan.</i>	
New Haven v. Ferrucci (Memorandum Decision)		901
Pacific Funding Trust 1002 v. Stephenson Residential Services, LLC		596
	<i>Foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly determined that defendant's special defenses were legally insufficient to present valid defense to matured mortgage; whether defendant's special defenses sufficiently apprised trial court that it was challenging amounts of debts, which would require evidentiary hearing.</i>	
PS Funding, Inc. v. Stephenson Residential Services, LLC (See Pacific Funding Trust 1002 v. Stephenson Residential Services, LLC)		596
Prioleau v. Agosta		248
	<i>Application for custody of minor child; claim that trial court lacked jurisdiction to grant defendant mother's motion to reconsider original judgment; claim that trial court abused its discretion in granting mother's motion to reconsider original judgment; claim that trial court abused its discretion in allocating parenting time by reducing number of overnight stays plaintiff father had with parties' minor child.</i>	
R. H. v. M. S.		212
	<i>Application for relief from abuse pursuant to statute (§ 46b-15); claim that trial court abused its discretion in extending protection of ex parte restraining order to minor children in absence of any request that it do so or any statements that defendant had engaged in conduct related to minor children; claim that trial</i>	

court abused its discretion in concluding that defendant’s conduct in driving near plaintiff’s house and sitting in her vehicle in two different locations over course of forty-five minute time period constituted act of stalking for purposes of § 46b-15.

State v. Despres 612

Motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction to hear defendant’s motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court’s denial of defendant’s motion to represent himself at sentencing hearing resulted in illegal sentence pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 43-22); whether defendant’s claim that defense counsel’s failure to turn over certain documents to defendant fell within ambit of Practice Book § 43-22.

State v. Griffin 225

Robbery first degree; assault second degree; whether trial court properly denied defendant’s motion to dismiss; claim that trial court violated defendant’s right to speedy trial pursuant to statute (§ 54-82m) and rule of practice (§ 43-41); claim that trial court violated defendant’s constitutional right to speedy trial; claim that trial court erred in denying defendant’s motion for new trial; claim that trial court improperly limited defense counsel’s cross-examination of witness; claim that prosecutor conducted improper in-court voice identification of defendant.

State v. King 549

Conspiracy to commit trafficking in persons; motion to correct illegal sentence; whether defendant’s motion to correct illegal sentence was jurisdictionally proper vehicle by which to challenge propriety of sentencing court’s imposition of requirement that defendant register as sex offender; claim that trial court’s imposition of special condition of probation that defendant register as sex offender was part of defendant’s sentence.

State v. Sullivan 403

Unlawful restraint second degree; sexual assault fourth degree; attempt to commit sexual assault third degree; sexual assault third degree; claim that prosecutor committed prosecutorial impropriety and deprived defendant of fair trial when she made certain improper statements during rebuttal closing argument; whether statement made by prosecutor discussing general defenses in criminal cases during argument was improper and implied that defendant had duty to present defense; whether statement made by prosecutor in rebuttal closing argument was inflammatory; whether defense counsel invited remarks by prosecutor by calling into question veracity of victim’s testimony; claim that defendant’s punishments stemming from his convictions of third degree sexual assault and fourth degree sexual assault violated his constitutional protection against double jeopardy; whether offenses charged arose from same act or transaction.

Stevens v. Khalily 634

Defamation; motion to strike; claim that trial court improperly struck defamation counts for failure to plead with requisite specificity; whether allegedly defamatory statements were defamation per se or defamation per quod; whether plaintiff’s defamation claims failed on alternative ground of failure to plead all elements of defamation per quod, specifically, reputational harm.

Strauss v. Strauss 193

Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motion for contempt; motion to open and vacate contempt findings; motion to stay trial court proceedings; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that it did not have authority to vacate its prior contempt orders; claim that trial court retained inherent equitable authority to vacate contempt orders beyond four month deadline imposed by applicable statute (§ 52-212a) and rule of practice (§ 17-4 (a)); reviewability of defendant’s claim on direct appeal that trial court improperly denied his motion to stay trial court proceedings during pendency of appeal, when defendant failed to file motion for review of that court’s decision pursuant to rule of practice (§ 66-6).

TLOA of CT, LLC v. Taibe 667

Foreclosure; municipal tax liens; motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly concluded that city complied with statute (§ 12-144b) when it applied defendant’s tax payments to his current taxes owed to city, rather than to tax lien that city had previously assigned to plaintiff.

U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Booker 783

Foreclosure; motion to open judgment; claim that this court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over defendants’ appeal; whether defendants’ appeal was moot; whether defendants abandoned claim regarding outstanding principal amount

of debt by failing to raise it in prior appeal; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying defendants' motion to open judgment; whether trial court should have afforded defendants relief in connection with their claims of mistake and fraud.