

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Appellate Reports
Volume 224

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

<p>Avon v. Sastre</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Administrative appeal; alleged violations of Freedom of Information Act (§ 1-200 et seq.); claim that trial court erred in finding that public employee's log of incidents regarding town's chief of police was public record as defined in statute (§ 1-200 (5)); claim that trial court erred in concluding that log was not exempt from disclosure as privileged attorney-client communication pursuant to statute (§ 1-210 (b) (10)).</i></p>	<p>155</p>
<p>Clark v. Quantitative Strategies Group, LLC</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Application for bank execution to satisfy domesticated judgment against defendant; motion for exemption from execution pursuant to statute ((Supp. 2022) § 52-367b); claim that plaintiff judgment creditors executed on bank accounts that did not belong to defendant; whether trial court properly found that bank accounts at issue were joint accounts and were not exempt from execution under § 52-367b; whether trial court correctly concluded that defendant's asserted exemption was not recognized or enumerated exemption that he was entitled to assert under § 52-367b; reviewability of defendant's claim for determination of interests pursuant to statute (§ 52-356c); whether defendant was authorized by § 52-356c to challenge bank's determination that he was co-owner of bank accounts by pursuing claim for determination of interests.</i></p>	<p>224</p>
<p>De Almeida-Kennedy v. Kennedy</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Dissolution of marriage; motion for modification of unallocated alimony and child support; claim that trial court abused its discretion in determining that change in residence of parties' child did not constitute substantial change in circumstances; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion for modification of unallocated alimony and child support without determining child support component of unallocated support order; procedure applicable on remand to financial aspects of modification of child support in context of unallocated support order, discussed; claim that trial court improperly interpreted alimony component of unallocated support order as set forth in parties' separation agreement to be nonmodifiable; whether trial court applied incorrect standard of law; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to modify alimony component of unallocated support order because it disallowed testimony of parties' child as to alleged cohabitation of plaintiff.</i></p>	<p>19</p>
<p>Donald G. v. Commissioner of Correction</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner was deprived of due process right to fair trial because appellate counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to raise claims on direct appeal from petitioner's criminal conviction that petitioner's criminal trial counsel failed to raise claims of prosecutorial impropriety and claim that state violated Brady v. Maryland (373 U.S. 83) by failing to provide petitioner with complete copy of police detective's notes; claim that petitioner was prejudiced by prosecutor's comment during closing argument to jury that petitioner had told detective "some BS" and prosecutor's use of term "victim" during trial; claim that petitioner was prejudiced by prosecutor's statement that witness who had not testified was in courtroom during prosecutor's closing argument to jury.</i></p>	<p>93</p>
<p>Greer v. State</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Petition for new trial; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying petitioner's petition for new trial based on newly discovered evidence; whether trial court properly determined that petitioner's purported new evidence, which consisted wholly of witness affidavit and testimony, would not, if introduced at new trial, likely result in different outcome.</i></p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Hine Builders, LLC v. Glasscock</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Arbitration; motion to compel arbitration; motion to terminate automatic appellate stay; whether defendants' appeal was rendered moot by commencement of arbitration proceedings following trial court's order to commence arbitration proceedings.</i></p>	<p>185</p>

Kuselias v. Zingaro & Cretella, LLC 192
Legal malpractice; motion for summary judgment; motion to reargue and reconsider; motion for judgment of nonsuit; accidental failure of suit statute (§ 52-592 (a)); claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment for defendants; claim that plaintiff's action was not time barred by applicable statute of limitations (§ 52-577) because action fell within purview of § 52-592; whether judgment of nonsuit rendered in prior action was result of matter of form for purposes of § 52-592; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's motion to reargue and reconsider its ruling on defendants' motion for summary judgment.

Marshall v. Marshall 45
Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court abused its discretion by basing alimony and child support orders on plaintiff's reported income rather than on her more recent partnership distributions; claim that trial court abused its discretion by basing alimony and child support orders on plaintiff's reported income rather than on her earning capacity.

Northeast Building Supply, LLC v. Morrill 137
Prejudgment remedy; vexatious litigation; subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiff had standing to pursue application for prejudgment remedy predicated on vexatious litigation claims that had been assigned to it from different entity.

Supronowicz v. Eaton 66
Adverse possession; claim that trial court erred in granting defendants' motion for summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly concluded that plaintiffs could not establish claim of adverse possession as matter of law; claim that trial court erred in determining that plaintiffs failed to demonstrate that privity existed between themselves and their predecessors in title for purposes of tacking periods of possession; claim that trial court improperly determined that no genuine issues of material fact remained regarding whether plaintiffs acknowledged defendants' superior title to disputed area and whether plaintiffs' use of disputed area was exclusive.