

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 328

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

ARC Capital, LLC v. Asia Pacific Ltd. (Order)	929
A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles	245
<i>Administrative appeal; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that there was lack of substantial evidence in record to support finding that plaintiff violated statute (§ 14-54) that required it to obtain certificate of approval from local authorities for certain location where it displayed motor vehicles; appeal dismissed on ground that certification improvidently granted.</i>	
Alston v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	923
Amica Mutual Ins. Co. v. Muldowney	428
<i>Subrogation; breach of contract; negligence; whether plaintiff insurer had right of subrogation as to landlord's claims against defendant tenants; claim that lease was insufficient to overcome presumption against subrogation articulated in DiLullo v. Joseph (259 Conn. 847), which held that landlord's insurer does not have right of subrogation against tenants unless there is specific agreement otherwise in lease; whether allowing subrogation in present case was fair and consistent with doctrine of equitable subrogation.</i>	
Artiaco v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	931
Barlow v. Commissioner of Correction	610
<i>Habeas corpus; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly concluded that new habeas judge was required by statute (§ 51-183c) to preside over proceedings following remand; whether Appellate Court properly concluded that habeas court had improperly barred petitioner from presenting evidence on remand for further proceedings on question of prejudice; appeal dismissed on ground that certification improvidently granted.</i>	
Beale v. Martins (Order) (See Rutter v. Janis)	930
Berka v. Middletown (Order)	939
Bouchard v. State Employees Retirement Commission	345
<i>Administrative appeal; declaratory judgment; class action; claim that trial court improperly determined that no time limitation applied for plaintiffs, retired state employees, to initiate their claims for recalculation of their retirement benefits pursuant to decision in Longley v. State Employees Retirement Commission (284 Conn. 149); claim that trial court improperly determined that plaintiffs' claims accrued when Longley was decided; claim that it was improper, in absence of statutory or regulatory time limitation for commencing action seeking to enforce duty created by statute, to apply analogous statute of limitations; whether rule permitting use of analogous statute of limitations was applicable to administrative proceedings; whether trial court properly determined that tolling mechanism of continuing violation theory was not applicable to plaintiffs' claim; whether continuous course of conduct doctrine applied to toll accrual of causes of action.</i>	
Bozelko v. Statewide Construction, Inc. (Order)	907
Brooks v. Powers	256
<i>Negligence; summary judgment; governmental immunity; claim that negligence of defendant town constables in responding to report that woman was standing in field during severe thunderstorm, possibly in need of medical attention, was proximate cause of woman's accidental drowning next morning; whether Appellate Court improperly determined that genuine issues of material fact existed as to whether defendants' conduct fell within identifiable person, imminent harm exception to governmental immunity; whether Appellate Court incorrectly determined that woman's drowning fell within scope of risk created by defendants' failure to immediately investigate report that woman was standing in field during storm, possibly in need of medical attention; whether woman's drowning was too attenuated from risk of harm created by storm for jury reasonably to</i>	

<i>conclude that it was storm related or imminent; whether woman's drowning in body of water one-half mile away from field many hours after she was observed in field was foreseeable harm.</i>	
Brown v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	919
Brown v. Shehadeh (Order)	926
Burke v. Mesniaeff (Order).	901
Carmon v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	913
Colon v. Commissioner of Correction (Order).	907
Connecticut Housing Finance Authority v. Alfaro.	134
<i>Foreclosure; attorney's fees; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court properly denied defendant's statutory (§ 42-150bb) motion for attorney's fees; whether § 42-150bb permits award of attorney's fees when commercial party withdraws action as of right pursuant to statute (§ 52-80) in response to defense mounted by consumer; claim that withdrawal of action pursuant to § 52-80 constitutes successful defense under § 42-150bb.</i>	
Cook-Littman v. Board of Selectmen	758
<i>Writ of mandamus; whether trial court properly ordered special election to fill vacancy on defendant board of selectman pursuant to statutory (§ 9-222) petition filed by plaintiff electors; whether provision of town charter (§ 6.3 [B]) providing for appointment of new selectman by remaining board members conflicted with procedure set forth in § 9-222; principles of home rule, discussed; claim that construing charter to permit vacancy to be filled by appointment would be anti-democratic and would disenfranchise town's electors.</i>	
Cuozzo v. Orange (Order)	906
DeJesus v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	918
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Savvoulides (Order)	939
Dinunzio v. Dinunzio (Order)	930
Disciplinary Counsel v. Hickey	688
<i>Application for reinstatement to bar after resignation; whether defendant attorney's knowing and voluntary waiver of right to apply for reinstatement served as permanent bar to such application; whether 2014 amendment to rule of practice [§ 2-53 (b)] pertaining to reinstatement applications retroactively applied to defendant's 2012 application; whether § 2-53 required trial court to forward defendant's reinstatement application to standing committee on recommendations for admission to bar; whether trial court had inherent authority to entertain motions to dismiss defendant's reinstatement application on ground that he was ineligible to apply for reinstatement; whether trial court properly granted motions to dismiss.</i>	
Dixon v. Eastcoast Music Mall (Order).	927
Doe v. West Hartford	172
<i>Summary judgment; reliance on statute (§ 52-593a) that operates to render action timely commenced if process to be served is personally delivered to marshal within limitation period and process is served within thirty days of delivery; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly concluded that requirement in § 52-593a (b) that marshal endorse on return of service date on which process was delivered to him was directory rather than mandatory; claim that Appellate Court improperly reversed trial court's decision to grant defendants' motions for summary judgment on ground that admissible evidence properly before trial court was sufficient to create genuine issue of material fact concerning whether plaintiff had delivered process to marshal within applicable limitation period.</i>	
Eastern Savings Bank FSB v. Toor (Order)	932
FirstLight Hydro Generating Co. v. Stewart	668
<i>Trespass; whether trial court properly found that defendants were trespassing on plaintiff's property; whether trial court's factual finding relating to plaintiff's ownership of land was supported by sufficient evidence; claim that trial court's injunctive relief was overly broad and exceeded scope of relief sought by plaintiff.</i>	
Ferreira v. Martins (Order) (See Rutter v. Janis)	930
Forgione v. Forgione (Orders).	922
Frantzen v. Davenport Electrical (Order)	928
Gamble v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	921

Gershon v. Back (Order)	925
Glastonbury v. Metropolitan District Commission	326
<i>Declaratory judgment; whether defendant quasi-municipal water company unlawfully imposed surcharges on plaintiff town; claim that trial court improperly granted plaintiff's motion for summary judgment; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law.</i>	
Gomez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	916
Griswold v. Camputaro (Order)	904
Harnage v. Lightner	248
<i>Civil action against state employees; service of process; personal jurisdiction; motion to dismiss; dismissal of claims against defendants in their individual capacities on ground that plaintiff did not properly serve them pursuant to statute (§ 52-57 [a]) governing service of process in civil actions; dismissal of claims against defendants in their official capacities on ground that plaintiff did not post recognizance bond pursuant to statute ([Rev. to 2013] §§ 52-185 and 52-186); remand of case to trial court by Appellate Court to determine whether plaintiff was entitled to waiver of recognizance bond requirement; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court properly had dismissed plaintiff's action against defendants in their individual capacities for lack of personal jurisdiction; mootness of issue of whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's claims against defendants in their official capacities on basis of plaintiff's failure to post recognizance bond.</i>	
Hazel v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	918
Heredia v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	925
Hines v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	938
Isenburg v. Isenburg (Order)	916
In re Damian G. (Order)	902
In re Jacob W. (Order)	902
In re Kyllan V. (Order)	929
Johnson v. Preleski (Order)	925
Jones v. State	84
<i>Petition for new trial based on newly discovered DNA evidence; whether new evidence satisfied fourth element for granting petition for new trial under Asherman v. State (202 Conn. 429) because it would probably produce different result in new trial; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court should have engaged in de novo review of whether new evidence was likely to produce different result; whether traditional considerations for applying abuse of discretion standard of review were implicated in present case when judge deciding petition for new trial did not preside at petitioner's criminal trial and parties agreed that new jury would credit new DNA evidence; claim that statute (§ 52-270) that authorizes petitions for new trial limited appellate court's review to determining whether trial court had abused its discretion; whether new evidence proved that it was less likely that petitioner had touched jacket that witness purportedly saw him discard after shooting; whether lack of DNA match between petitioner and hairs found in victim's car would lead to different result at new trial.</i>	
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Davis (Order)	921
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Essaghof (Order)	915
Keeley v. Ayala	393
<i>Elections; primaries; action brought by aggrieved candidate pursuant to statute (§ 9-329a) to challenge absentee balloting process during special primary and seeking order directing new special primary; reservation of questions of law; appeal from trial court's judgment; whether statute (§ 9-140b) governing procedure for returning absentee ballots prohibited political party official or candidate from directing police officer to act as designee for absentee voter by retrieving his or her absentee ballot and delivering it to town clerk; whether trial court's factual finding that absentee ballots without postmarks were not sent by United States Postal Service and, thus, were not "mailed," as contemplated by § 9-140b (c), was clearly erroneous; whether trial court's conclusion that supervised absentee balloting conducted at certain nursing home did not comply with minimum requirements of law was supported by evidence; whether trial court correctly determined that result of special primary had been placed seriously in doubt based on violations of law governing absentee balloting procedure.</i>	
Kirby of Norwich v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act	38
<i>Unemployment compensation; whether members of plaintiff's sales force who engaged in door-to-door sales of plaintiff's products were employees of plaintiff</i>	

or independent contractors under Unemployment Compensation Act (§ 31-222 et seq.); whether trial court correctly determined that plaintiff failed to establish that sales representatives were customarily engaged in independently established trade, occupation, profession or business of same nature as that involved in service performed for plaintiff, as required by part C of ABC test, as set forth in § 31-222 (a) (1) (B) (ii) (I), (II) and (III), which governs determination of whether services performed by individual constitute employment; claim that trial court interpreted § 31-222 (a) (1) (B) (ii) (III) too narrowly and incorrectly concluded that sales representatives were plaintiff's employees; whether trial court properly dismissed appeals from decisions of defendant Employment Security Board of Review; failure of plaintiff to present evidence of factors that court may consider under totality of circumstances test for evaluating dynamics of relationship between putative employee and employer; claim that this court should reconsider and overrule prior case law holding that part C of ABC test is satisfied only if putative employee is actually engaged in independently established trade, occupation, profession or business of same nature as that involved in service performed for putative employer.

Lebron v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	913
MacDermid, Inc. v. Leonetti	726
<i>Unjust enrichment; workers' compensation; whether plaintiff employer's unjust enrichment claim was barred by doctrine of collateral estoppel; claim that plaintiff's recovery was barred by statutory (§§ 31-290 and 31-296) provisions requiring approval of contractual workers' compensation releases, public policy, and severability clause contained in termination agreement between parties; preservation of issues through motions for directed verdict, discussed; whether trial court improperly failed to instruct jury in accordance with defendant's preliminary requests to charge; claim that trial court's instruction on unjust enrichment improperly permitted jury to find for plaintiff in absence of proof that any of defendant's actions or omissions caused plaintiff injury; whether defendant's claim of instructional error was barred by general verdict rule; claim that trial court improperly excluded certain documents from evidence; whether certain evidentiary claims were rendered moot by defendant's failure to challenge independent grounds for exclusion.</i>	
Marchesi v. Board of Selectmen	615
<i>Statutory (§ 13a-39) petition by defendant adjoining landowners requesting definition of highway boundaries by defendant board of selectmen; administrative appeal from determination of board pursuant to statute (§ 13a-40); claim that judicial determination regarding public status of highway is jurisdictional prerequisite to definitional proceeding under § 13a-39; whether certain procedural irregularities deprived board or trial court of jurisdiction; claim that absence of signature by plaintiff and another adjoining landowner rendered underlying petition jurisdictionally defective; whether trial court's decision to confirm board's finding pertaining to width of highway was clearly erroneous.</i>	
Martin v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	926
Martinez v. New Haven	1
<i>Negligent supervision; claim, pursuant to statute (§ 52-557n), that defendant city and defendant board of education were negligent in failing to properly supervise students in auditorium; whether trial court improperly determined that plaintiff schoolchild, who at school during school hours, satisfied imminent harm to identifiable persons exception to governmental immunity; whether plaintiff failed to satisfy imminent harm prong of that exception because he failed to prove that it was apparent to defendants that claimed dangerous condition, namely, students running with safety scissors, was so likely to cause harm that clear and unequivocal duty to act immediately was created; claim that defendants failed to plead governmental immunity as special defense in operative answer; whether trial court, which never expressly ruled on defendants' request to amend their answer to include governmental immunity as special defense, implicitly granted request to amend answer and overruled objection thereto.</i>	
Meadowbrook Center, Inc. v. Buchman	586
<i>Attorney's fees; breach of contract; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly reversed trial court's denial of defendant's statutory (§ 42-150bb) postjudgment motion for attorney's fees; whether thirty day filing deadline set forth in rule of practice (§ 11-21) governing such motions was directory or mandatory in nature; claim that, even if trial court had discretion to entertain untimely motion for attorney's fees, defendant's motion was nevertheless barred</i>	

	<i>as matter of law; whether Appellate Court properly remanded case to trial court for hearing on defendant's motion; standard governing consideration of untimely filings, discussed.</i>	
Megos v. Ranta (Order)		917
Meletrich v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)		908
Meribear Productions, Inc. v. Frank		709
	<i>Action to enforce foreign default judgment; breach of contract; quantum meruit; certification from Appellate Court; whether trial court's judgment was final as to both defendants; whether Appellate Court lacked jurisdiction over defendants' joint appeal; two categories of alternative theory cases distinguished for purposes of final judgment rule.</i>	
Metropolitan District v. Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities (Order)		937
Micek-Holt v. Papageorge (Order)		934
Morgan v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)		924
Mundle v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)		920
MYM Realty, LLC v. Doe (Orders)		927
NationStar Mortgage LLC v. Washington (Order)		930
Nationstar Mortgage, LLC v. Washington (Order)		941
O'Brien v. New Haven (Orders)		909
Papageorge v. Micek-Holt (Order) (See Micek-Holt v. Papageorge)		934
Pettiford v. State (Order)		919
Pritsker v. Keating (Order)		915
Ridgaway v. Mount Vernon Fire Ins. Co.		60
	<i>Insurance; action to recover damages for defendant's refusal to provide coverage under insurance policy it issued to its insured, which had assigned its rights in policy to plaintiffs as part of settlement agreement in related action; motion for nonsuit based on plaintiffs' failure to comply with discovery order; motion to open judgment of nonsuit; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court incorrectly determined that trial court had abused its discretion in rendering judgment of nonsuit for counsel's failure to comply with order of court; claim that Appellate Court improperly applied proportionality test that applies only to sanctions for violations of discovery orders; whether judgment of nonsuit was proportionate sanction in light of entirety of factual findings; remand for trial court to conduct hearing on sanctions.</i>	
Reinke v. Sing		376
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court had subject matter jurisdiction and authority to determine plaintiff's claim seeking modification of dissolution judgment; claim that trial court was deprived of subject matter jurisdiction by statute (§ 46b-86 [a]) providing that trial court may not modify portion of dissolution judgment that assigns estate of one party to other party; whether provisions of § 46b-86 (a) are subject matter jurisdictional; whether Sousa v. Sousa (157 Conn. App. 587) was wrongly decided; whether statute (§ 52-212a) authorized trial court to open dissolution judgment when parties had orally agreed to submit to court's jurisdiction.</i>	
Rockwell v. Rockwell (Order)		902
Rutter v. Janis (Order)		930
St. Juste v. Commissioner of Correction		198
	<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to advise petitioner of immigration consequences of pleading guilty to assault in second degree; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that petitioner's appeal from trial court's denial of habeas petition was moot; whether, in light of petitioner's deportation during pendency of appeal, any practical relief could be provided in connection with assault conviction; whether petitioner's prior conviction of threatening in second degree constituted crime of moral turpitude barring petitioner's reentry into country; collateral consequences doctrine, discussed.</i>	
Silver v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)		940
Spencer v. Spencer (Order)		903
Stackpole v. Stamford (Order)		933
Stanley v. State's Attorney (Order)		926
Stamford v. Pepaj (Order)		940
State v. Andrews (Order)		911
State v. Angel M. (Order)		931
State v. Anthony L. (Order)		918
State v. Antwon W. (Order)		924

State v. Azevedo (Order)	908
State v. Blaine (Order)	917
State v. Bobe (Order)	920
State v. Brown (Order)	914
State v. Bush (Order)	913
State v. Campbell	444
<i>Capital felony; murder; attempt to commit murder; assault first degree; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; whether defendant's appeal with respect to his claims challenging penalty phase should be dismissed on ground that those claims were not ripe; claim that defendant was denied his due process right to be present during two unrecorded pretrial scheduling conferences; whether scheduling conferences were critical stages of prosecution; claim that trial court's denial of defendant's motions for pretrial continuances deprived defendant of due process right to fair trial; claim that trial court's failure to excuse three jurors violated defendant's right to impartial jury under federal and state constitutions; whether trial court properly found that defendant was competent to stand trial; whether trial court improperly interpreted defendant's burden to overcome statutory (§ 54-56d [b]) presumption of competence to require that he produce experts who could testify with certainty that his failure to communicate with defense counsel was not volitional; claim that trial court's interpretation of § 54-56d (b) as requiring him to bear different burden to rebut presumption of competence than that which would have applied if trial court had sua sponte raised issue violated his right to equal protection; claim that phrases "at the same time" and "in the course of a single transaction" in capital felony statute ([Rev. to 1999] § 53a-54b [8]) were void for vagueness as applied to defendant's conduct; whether evidence was sufficient to prove beyond reasonable doubt that defendant had committed capital felony, murder and attempt to commit murder; whether record supported defendant's contention that no reasonable juror could have found that he failed to meet his burden of establishing by preponderance of evidence his affirmative defense that he had acted under influence of extreme emotional disturbance; claim that admission of autopsy reports prepared by medical examiner who did not testify at trial violated defendant's rights under federal and state constitutions to confront his accusers; claim that defendant was deprived of fair trial when trial court improperly failed to strike, sua sponte, evidence regarding existence of protective order and failed to instruct jury to disregard that evidence; whether trial court improperly admitted evidence of defendant's uncharged misconduct to prove either motive, means to commit charged crimes, or identity; whether trial court improperly instructed jury regarding purpose for which it could consider evidence of uncharged misconduct; whether trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to suppress certain eyewitness identifications as unreliable and product of unnecessarily suggestive identification procedures, in violation of his right to due process; whether trial court's failure to include certain language requested by defendant in its instruction on affirmative defense of extreme emotional disturbance, even if improper, was harmless; claim that numerous statements by prosecutor during closing and rebuttal argument were improper and violated defendant's right to fair trial; claim that prosecutor's remarks in her closing argument misstated law concerning intent; whether prosecutor improperly urged jurors to draw speculative inferences for which there was no support in record; claim that prosecutor's use of phrases "we know" and "you know" during her closing argument was improper; whether prosecutor improperly vouched for witness; whether defendant could establish prejudice from prosecutor's improper remark during rebuttal argument that "[m]urderers take risks"; whether prosecutor improperly commented on defendant's failure to testify; claim that trial court improperly failed to inquire about whether defendant's right to counsel was jeopardized by potential conflict of interest; claim that this court should adopt federal cumulative error doctrine.</i>	
State v. Cushard	558
<i>Robbery first degree; assault first degree; burglary first degree; whether defendant was deprived of right to counsel under sixth amendment to federal constitution; claim that defendant was entitled to automatic reversal of judgment of conviction despite valid, subsequent waiver of right to counsel because his initial waiver was inadequate; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly applied harmless error review to defendant's claim of inadequate waiver; whether defendant's lack of counsel was structural error because it affected fair-</i>	

<i>ness of entire criminal proceedings; adequacy of record to determine impact on trial due to lack of counsel; whether defendant's lack of counsel was harmless beyond reasonable doubt due to subsequent, valid waiver of right to counsel.</i>	
State v. Daniel W. (Order)	929
State v. Davis (Order)	941
State v. Dyouss (Order)	932
State v. Frazier (Order)	938
State v. Grant (Order)	910
State v. Harris (Order)	940
State v. Hudson (Order)	936
State v. Jackson (Order)	910
State v. Johnson (Order)	905
State v. Josephs	21
<i>Cruelty to animals; claim that statute (§ 53-247 [a]) prohibiting person from unjustifiably injuring animal requires proof that defendant had specific intent to injure animal; whether trial court properly concluded that § 53-247 (a) required only general intent to engage in conduct in question; claim that § 53-247 (a) was unconstitutionally vague as applied to defendant's conduct; whether defendant's conduct clearly came within unmistakable core of conduct prohibited under § 53-247 (a); whether evidence was sufficient to convict defendant pursuant to § 53-247 (a).</i>	
State v. Lebrick (Order)	912
State v. Louis D. (Order)	936
State v. Manousos (Order)	919
State v. Montana (Order)	911
State v. Neary (Order)	901
State v. Outlaw (Order)	910
State v. Panek	219
<i>Voyeurism; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's dismissal of charges; whether video voyeurism statute (§ 53a-189a [a] [1]) that requires victim to be not in plain view refers to plain view of defendant or plain view of public generally; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that § 53a-189a (a) (1) plainly and unambiguously referred to plain view of defendant; whether legislature intended not in plain view to refer to plain view of public generally; claim that ambiguity in § 53a-189a (a) (1) should be resolved in defendant's favor under rule of lenity; claim that § 53a-189a (a) (1) was unconstitutionally vague on its face and as applied to defendant's conduct.</i>	
State v. Porter	648
<i>Assault of public safety personnel; interfering with officer; possession of narcotic substance; claim that defendant's conviction of both assault of public safety personnel and interfering with officer violated constitutional prohibition against double jeopardy; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly reviewed evidence presented at trial in connection with its double jeopardy analysis; whether Appellate Court properly rejected defendant's double jeopardy claim; claim that allowing court to review evidence in determining whether offenses arose from same act or transaction contravened constitutional principles of notice and unduly complicated defendant's legal defense.</i>	
State v. Richard P. (Order)	924
State v. Robert S. (Order)	933
State v. Salmond (Order)	936
State v. Small (Order)	938
State v. Smith (Order)	906
State v. Smith (Order)	927
State v. Soyini (Order)	935
State v. Stanley (Order)	907
State v. Stanley (Order)	911
State v. Swilling (Order)	937
State v. Thomas (Order)	935
State v. Tucker (Order)	917
State v. Vivo (Order)	939
State v. Walker (Order)	933
Szymonik v. Szymonik (Order)	932
Thomas v. Thomas (Order)	920
Toland v. Toland (Order)	935

Torres v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	912
U.S. Bank National Assn., Trustee v. Blowers (Order)	904
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Tope (Order)	921
U.S. Bank National Association v. Christophersen (Order)	928
Valley National Bank v. Private Transerve, LLC (Order)	933
Valliere v. Commissioner of Social Services	294
<i>Administrative appeal; application for Medicaid benefits; whether trial court properly sustained appeal from decision upholding denial of spousal support allowance; claim that preexisting spousal support order issued by Probate Court pursuant to statute (§ 45a-655 [b] and [d]) was binding on Commissioner of Social Services in connection with calculation of certain Medicaid benefits; statutory (§ 17b-261b) right of commissioner to intervene in certain Probate Court proceedings, discussed.</i>	
Vitale v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	923
Wachovia Mortgage, FSB v. Toczek (Order)	914
Wiederman v. Halpert (Order)	906
Zilkha v. Zilkha (Order)	937