

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 327

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Rodriguez (Order)	992
American First Federal, Inc. v. Gordon (Order)	909
Ampero v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	953
Arroyo v. University of Connecticut Health Center (Order)	973
Avery v. Medina (Order)	927
Bagley v. Adel Wiggins Group	89
<i>Product liability; action pursuant to Connecticut's Product Liability Act (§ 52-572m et seq.) alleging wrongful death of decedent based on his exposure to defendant's allegedly defective asbestos containing product; motion for directed verdict; motion to set aside verdict and for judgment notwithstanding verdict; whether expert testimony was necessary to prove plaintiff's strict liability and negligence claims; whether plaintiff proved through competent expert testimony that defendant's product was dangerous and that product's dangerous condition caused decedent to develop mesothelioma; whether court's holding compelled by law as it existed at time of trial or whether it stemmed from principles newly articulated in court's recent product liability jurisprudence, entitling plaintiff to new trial.</i>	
Bank of America, N.A. v. Fisher (Order)	903
Bank of America, N.A. v. Sabir (Order)	903
Bank of New York Mellon v. Lindsey (Order)	931
Bank of New York Mellon v. Mauro (Order)	986
Bank of New York Mellon v. Worth (Order)	1000
Beck & Beck, LLC v. Costello (Order)	1000
Bigelow v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	929
Bozelko v. D'Albero (Order)	912
Brander v. Stoddard (Order)	928
Buono v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	907
Byrne v. Avery Center for Obstetrics & Gynecology, P.C.	540
<i>Negligence; negligent infliction of emotional distress; whether trial court properly granted summary judgment in favor of defendant health care provider; whether cause of action for breach of duty of confidentiality arising out of physician-patient relationship is recognized by common law; whether existence of subpoena precluded liability; recognition of common-law causes of action, discussed.</i>	
Cadle Co. v. Ogalin (Order)	930
CCT Communications, Inc. v. Zone Telecom, Inc.	114
<i>Breach of contract; declaratory judgment; whether trial court made finding of breach based on plaintiff telecommunication company's failure to provide adequate service; whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiff's act of filing for bankruptcy constituted material breach that permitted defendant telecommunication company to terminate parties' agreement; whether defendant validly exercised contractual right to terminate agreement following plaintiff's voluntary bankruptcy petition pursuant to ipso facto clause in agreement notwithstanding federal statute (11 U.S.C. § 365 [e]) generally barring enforcement of such clauses; common-law ride-through doctrine, discussed; whether trial court's judgment could be affirmed on alternative ground that contract fell within statutory (11 U.S.C. § 556) exception to 11 U.S.C. § 365 (e) for commodity forward contracts.</i>	
Cimino v. Cimino (Order)	929
CitiMortgage, Inc. v. Tanasi (Order)	978
Clinton S. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	927
Cohen v. Cohen	485
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion to modify alimony based on substantial increase in defendant's income; whether prior modification order was sufficient to fulfill underlying purpose of original alimony award; claim that trial court improperly considered parties' financial circumstances at time of divorce decree when it granted motion to modify prior modification order; claim that court was barred from considering purpose of original alimony award when crafting modification;</i>	

<i>whether plaintiff's motion for modification was legally insufficient on its face on ground that it alleged only that defendant's income had significantly increased; whether court properly considered extrinsic evidence of parties' intent when they entered into separation agreement; claim that court improperly took judicial notice of plaintiff's previous financial affidavit in court file; claim that trial court's modification order was impermissible; claim that allowing supported spouse to share supporting spouse's standard of living after divorce was not legitimate purpose of original alimony award; whether court was required, under Dan v. Dan (315 Conn. 1), to presume that exclusive purpose of alimony award in present case was to allow plaintiff to maintain standard of living that she had enjoyed during marriage.</i>	
Cohen v. Meyers (Order)	973
Colonial Investors, LLC v. Furbush (Order)	968
Commissioner of Public Health v. Colandrea (Order)	957
Connecticut Coalition for Justice in Education Funding, Inc. v. Rell.	650
<i>Declaratory and injunctive relief; claim that state's failure to provide suitable and substantially equal educational opportunities violated individual plaintiffs' rights to free education under Connecticut constitution (art. VIII, § 1), and equal rights (art. I, § 1) and equal protection (art. I, § 20, as amended) provisions of Connecticut constitution; claim that individual plaintiffs lacked standing because they failed to present evidence of specific injury; whether named plaintiff lacked associational standing under Connecticut Assn. of Health Care Facilities, Inc. v. Worrell (199 Conn. 609); claim that trial court improperly allowed plaintiffs to amend complaint and cure jurisdictional defect on ground that named plaintiff had no members when original complaint was filed; whether named plaintiff did not meet first prong of Worrell test because parent members lacked right to vote; whether potential conflicts of interest among members of named plaintiff deprived it of associational standing; whether named plaintiff satisfied third prong of Worrell because neither claim asserted nor relief requested required participation of individual members; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that state's educational system met criteria set forth in Campaign for Fiscal Equity, Inc. v. State (86 N.Y.2d 307) (Campaign I), and adopted in concurring opinion in Connecticut Coalition for Justice in Education Funding, Inc. v. Rell (295 Conn. 240); whether concurring opinion provided controlling constitutional standard; whether standard that trial court applied to claim under article eighth, § 1, was inconsistent with concurring opinion in Rell; whether trial court improperly applied constitutional standard of its own devising after concluding that Campaign I criteria were met; whether trial court violated separation of powers principles by applying constitutional standard of its own devising; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that evidence did not support plaintiffs' claim that Campaign I criteria were not met; whether plaintiffs established that disparities in educational funding between neediest and least needy school districts violated equal rights and protection provisions of state constitution under Horton v. Meskill (195 Conn. 24); claim that there could be no equal rights or protection violation if plaintiffs were receiving minimally adequate educational opportunity under article eighth, § 1; whether evidence supported prima facie showing by plaintiffs that disparities in educational funding were more than de minimis; whether defendants satisfied second and third parts of Horton, which required them to prove that disparities in education spending were justified by legitimate state policy and were not so great as to be unconstitutional.</i>	
Cook-Littman v. Board of Selectmen (Order)	956
Corsair Special Situations Fund, L.P. v. Engineered Framing Systems, Inc.	467
<i>Writ of execution; motion for turnover order when third party failed to comply with writ; intervention in federal action by marshal who claimed entitlement to fee pursuant to statute (§ 52-261 [a] [F]) for levying execution; appeal to Second Circuit Court of Appeals by plaintiff from order of United States District Court for District of Connecticut directing plaintiff to pay marshal 15 percent fee pursuant to § 52-261 (a) (F); certification of questions of law from Second Circuit Court of Appeals; whether marshal entitled to 15 percent fee under § 52-261 (a) (F); whether, in determining marshal's entitlement to fee, it mattered that writ was ignored by third party and money that was subject of writ was procured only after plaintiff, not marshal, pursued further enforcement proceedings in courts.</i>	
Costa v. Plainville Board of Education (Order)	961
Crouse v. Sloat (Order)	984
Darryl W. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	989

Dejana v. Dejana (Order) 977

Deutsche Bank AG v. Sebastian Holdings, Inc. (Orders) 966,967

Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) 957

Diehl v. Powell (Order) 979

Dull v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) 930

Emerick v. Emerick (Order) 922

Emerick v. Glastonbury (Order) 994

Epps v. Commissioner of Correction 482

Habeas corpus; certification from Appellate Court; whether, in collateral proceeding, where petitioner claims that trial court improperly omitted element of criminal charge in final instructions to jury, is proper standard for assessing harm measured in accordance with standard in Brecht v. Abrahamson (507 U.S. 619) or standard in Neder v. United States (527 U.S. 1); whether, irrespective of which standard applied, harm had been established in petitioner's criminal case; appeal dismissed on ground that certification improvidently granted.

Evans v. Tiger Claw, Inc. (Order) 976

Fernschild v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles (Order) 997

Financial Freedom Acquisition, LLC v. Griffin (Order) 931

Fitzpatrick v. U.S. Bank National Assn. (Order) 902

Francini v. Goodspeed Airport, LLC 431

Declaratory judgment; easement by necessity; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly reversed summary judgment rendered by trial court in favor of defendant; claim that plaintiff landowner entitled to easement by necessity for underground commercial utilities along preexisting deeded right-of-way.

Freeman v. A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. (Order) 927

Freer v. Chien (Order) 987

Freer v. Fu (Order) 988

Friedman v. Dooven (Order) 993

Girolametti v. Michael Horton Associates, Inc. (Orders) 963,964,966

Girolametti v. Michael Horton Associates, Inc. (Orders) 980,981

Girolametti v. VP Buildings, Inc. (Orders) 964,965

Girolametti v. VP Buildings, Inc. (Orders) 982,983

Gordon v. Gordon (Order) 904

Gostyla v. Chambers (Order) 993

Harper-Wilson v. A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. (Order) 959

Haughey v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) 906

Heinonen v. Gupton (Order) 902

Hull v. Newtown 402

Personal injury; summary judgment; immunity from statutory (§ 52-557n) municipal liability; whether police department policies governing arrests and prisoner transportation imposed ministerial, nondiscretionary duty on its officers to search individual taken into custody pursuant to civil commitment statute (§ 17a-503 [a]) and transported to hospital for emergency evaluation; discretionary and ministerial acts, distinguished.

Hutterly v. Miller (Order) 904

Hynes v. Jones (Order) 930

In re Egypt E. 506

Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court improperly terminated respondents' parental rights as to their minor child pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112 [j] [3] [C]) because there was no evidence that acts of parental commission or omission had caused child to suffer harm prior to her removal from respondents' home; whether termination of parental rights improperly was based on finding of predictive harm; whether trial court improperly found that criteria of § 17a-112 (j) (3) (C) had been proven on basis of respondents' postremoval acts of parental omission, including their continuing failure to acknowledge cause of injuries to their other child; whether there was sufficient evidence presented to establish that respondents' omissions were harmful to child; claim that expert testimony was insufficient to establish that child had been psychologically harmed.

In re Eliahah T.-T. (Order) 912

In re Henry P. B.-P. 312

Petitions for appointment of coguardian and juvenile status findings pursuant to statute (§ 45a-608n [b]); certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly affirmed judgments of Superior Court dismissing probate appeals;

<i>whether Probate Court was divested of authority to make findings under § 45a-608n (b) when minor child reached age of eighteen during pendency of underlying proceeding.</i>	
In re Ceana R. (Order)	991
In re Luis N. (Orders)	958
Inzitari v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	902
Ionescu v. Stratford (Order)	901
James v. Commissioner of Correction	24
<i>Habeas corpus; whether calculation of presentence confinement credit should be adjusted for concurrent sentences imposed under one docket number but on different dates due to mistrial; whether denial of presentence confinement credit impermissibly burdened petitioner's constitutional right to pursue double jeopardy claim on retrial.</i>	
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Davis (Order)	908
JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. v. Herman (Order)	960
Kruger v. Grauer (Order)	901
Lavigne v. Sarantopoulos (Order)	991
Lederle v. Spivey (Order)	954
Levanti v. Conway (Order)	919
Little v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	990
Luongo Construction & Development, LLC v. MacFarlane (Order)	988
Mangiafico v. Farmington (Order)	920
Marra v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	955
McClancy v. Bank of America, N.A. (Order)	975
McFarlane v. Mickens (Order)	997
MYM Realty, LLC v. Doe (Order)	908
Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co. v. Pasiak.	225
<i>Action seeking declaratory judgment to determine whether plaintiff insurance companies were obligated to defend and indemnify defendant in personal injury action brought against him; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly determined that business pursuits exclusion of defendant's personal umbrella policy precluded him from obtaining indemnification; proper standard for determining whether defendant's false imprisonment of his construction company's employee arose out of his business pursuits in operating that company; whether indemnification was precluded under umbrella policy's exclusion for insured's obligation to pay workers' compensation benefits; whether indemnification barred under policy's exclusion for personal injury resulting from physical or mental abuse; whether, in absence of express grant of coverage for punitive damages in insured's policy, it would be violation of public policy to construe policy to indemnify wrongdoer for punitive damages; claim that trial court improperly limited scope of discovery and declaratory judgment trial, depriving plaintiffs of trial de novo on coverage issues they could not litigate in underlying tort action.</i>	
New Haven Parking Authority v. Long Wharf Realty Corp. (Order)	928
Northrup v. Witkowski (Order)	971
OneWest Bank, FSB v. Gnazzo (Order)	922
Pajor v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act (Order)	977
Pascarella v. Silver (Order)	931
Pentland v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	978
Pereira v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	984
Pires v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	907
Presidential Village, LLC v. Perkins (Order)	974
Procaccini v. Lawrence & Memorial Hospital, Inc. (Order)	960
Pronovost v. Tierney (Order)	922
Puff v. Puff (Orders)	994
R.T. Vanderbilt Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co. (Orders)	923, 925
Ramos v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	904
Redding Life Care, LLC v. Redding (Order)	991
Reserve Realty, LLC v. BLT Reserve, LLC (Order)	911
Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC (Orders)	910, 911
Retained Realty, Inc. v. Lenahan (Order)	975
Rockstone Capital, LLC v. Sanzo (Order)	968
Rogers v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	929
Salters v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	969
Santos v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	977

Santos v. Stratford (Order)	926
Sinchak v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	901
Smith v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	920
Smith v. Redding (Order)	996
Sousa v. Sousa (Order)	906
State v. Adams	297
<i>Breach of peace second degree; attempted larceny sixth degree; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that evidence was insufficient to support defendant's conviction of attempted larceny in connection with his attempt to shoplift bag of items from store; whether evidence supported reasonable inference that items in bag that defendant abandoned while fleeing belonged to store; whether evidence of defendant's flight could be used to establish that crime was committed.</i>	
State v. Ames (Order)	908
State v. Andino (Order)	906
State v. Biggs (Order)	975
State v. Boyd (Order)	972
State v. Bozelko (Order)	973
State v. Carter (Order)	960
State v. Cuadrado (Order)	979
State v. Damato-Kushel	173
<i>Writ of error; trial court's ruling precluding plaintiff in error from attending pretrial disposition conferences in criminal case in which he was alleged victim; claim that trial court's ruling barring attendance of plaintiff in error at pretrial disposition conferences violated his right as victim to attend court proceedings that accused has right to attend, as set forth in victim's rights amendment (Conn. Const., amend. XXIX [b] [5]); claim that this court lacked jurisdiction over writ of error on ground that plaintiff in error was not aggrieved by trial court's ruling and that ruling was not appealable final judgment; whether trial court's ruling was improper; whether in-chambers, off-the-record disposition conferences between prosecuting attorney, defense counsel, and presiding judge are court proceedings that accused has right to attend under victim's rights amendment.</i>	
State v. Danovan T. (Order)	992
State v. Eddie N. C. (Order)	1000
State v. Elmer G. (Order)	971
State v. Fowler (Order)	999
State v. Franklin (Order)	961
State v. Gill (Order)	987
State v. Halili (Order)	961
State v. Hall-Davis (Order)	987
State v. Holley (Order)	907
State v. Holley	576
<i>Felony murder; home invasion; conspiracy to commit home invasion; burglary in first degree; robbery in first degree; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had violated defendant's constitutional right to present defense by imposing condition on decision to preclude admission of accomplice's statements that were otherwise barred under Crawford v. Washington (541 U.S. 36); whether unpreserved claim was constitutional in nature; whether Appellate Court improperly ordered new trial on basis of its determination that trial court's conditional ruling violated defendant's right to present defense; whether unpreserved claim failed under State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233); whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had abused its discretion in admitting lay opinion testimony from police detective that he observed what appeared to be bite mark on accomplice's hand; whether Appellate Court incorrectly determined that trial court had abused its discretion in admitting lay opinion testimony of another police detective that contours of object in defendant's backpack appeared to be those of shoe box; whether trial court's admission of lay opinion testimony, even if improper, was harmless; claims, raised as alternative grounds for affirming Appellate Court's judgment; that trial court improperly admitted testimony from two witnesses who were on bus that defendant and his accomplice were riding after commission of charged crimes, and testimony from police detective; claim, raised as alternative ground for affirming Appellate Court's judgment, that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion for mistrial in response to police detective's testimony that defendant's accomplice stated to him that injury on accomplice's hand was bite.</i>	

State v. Holmes (Order)	984
State v. Jackson (Order)	998
State v. James E.	212
<i>Risk of injury to child; certification from Appellate Court; whether decision of Appellate Court that defendant's conviction was supported by evidence that he created risk of harm to child's mental health should be upheld on alternative ground that evidence was sufficient to prove that defendant wilfully caused his child to be placed in situation in which her life or limb was endangered; claim that evidence was insufficient to prove that defendant created situation that endangered child's life or limb; whether defendant had requisite general intent to commit risk of injury to child.</i>	
State v. Jones (Order)	905
State v. Joseph (Order)	912
State v. Lewis (Order)	925
State v. Liam M. (Order)	978
State v. Lopez (Order)	989
State v. Manning (Order)	999
State v. McGee (Order)	970
State v. Miranda	451
<i>Murder; claim that trial court incorrectly failed to strike certain improper testimony from witness regarding police photographic array; whether defendant waived that claim by approving of trial court's proposed remedy; claim that testimony by victim's mother indicating that she had heard information relating defendant to victim's disappearance constituted inadmissible hearsay; whether hearsay claim was preserved.</i>	
State v. Morales (Order)	988
State v. O'Donnell (Order)	956
State v. Patel (Orders)	932, 955
State v. Pelella	1
<i>Threatening second degree; appeal by state on granting of permission; first amendment to United States constitution; whether trial court improperly granted motion to dismiss charges; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that law required alleged threat to be imminent for it to constitute true threat; whether trial court improperly viewed evidence before it in light most favorable to defendant in ruling on motion to dismiss; whether issue of whether statement constituted true threat was for jury to decide.</i>	
State v. Pugh (Order)	985
State v. Purcell (Order)	921
State v. Purcell (Order)	959
State v. Reed (Order)	974
State v. Raynor (Order)	969
State v. Reddick (Order)	921
State v. Sampson (Order)	920
State v. Sienkiewicz (Order)	997
State v. Smith (Order)	910
State v. Soto (Order)	970
State v. Spell (Order)	956
State v. Stallworth (Order)	998
State v. Steele (Order)	962
State v. Taylor (Order)	998
State v. Thomas (Order)	985
State v. Toro (Order)	905
State v. Torres (Order)	910
State v. Torres (Order)	958
State v. Torres (Order)	995
State v. Urbanowski	169
<i>Assault second degree; breach of peace second degree; strangulation second degree; threatening second degree; certification from Appellate Court; claim that trial court improperly admitted prior uncharged misconduct evidence; whether improper admission of evidence was harmless; adoption of Appellate Court's opinion as proper statement of issue of harmlessness and applicable law concerning that issue.</i>	
State v. Walker (Order)	999
State v. Walton (Order)	970
State v. Wiggins (Order)	908

State v. Williams (Order)	980
State v. Young (Order)	976
Stephen J. R. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	995
Stones Trail, LLC v. Weston (Orders)	926
Sunbelt Rentals, Inc. v. Douglas P. Fleming, LLC (Order)	972
Szymonik v. Szymonik (Order)	903
Tao v. Court of Probate (Order)	979
Teixeira v. Home Depot, Inc. (Order)	976
Thomson v. Dept. of Social Services (Order)	962
Thorpe v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	905
Tilus v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	962
Toccaline v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	986
Townsend v. Hardy (Order)	909
21st Century North America Ins. Co. v. Perez (Order)	995
US Bank National Assn. v. Brouillard (Order)	954
Village Mortgage Co. v. Veneziano (Order)	957
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Owen (Order)	955
Wells Fargo Bank, National Assn. v. Tarzia (Order)	928
Wellswood Columbia, LLC v. Hebron	53
<i>Action to recover damages for temporary taking, temporary nuisance, and tortious interference with business expectancies; whether doctrine of res judicata barred plaintiffs' action; whether takings claim accrued after injunction had been issued in first action; whether accrual of takings claim was postponed because extent of plaintiffs' damages was uncertain; claim that defendant town's road closure constituted temporary nuisance or continuing or recurrent wrong; claim that there was genuine issue of material fact as to whether plaintiffs had sustained losses prior to first action for purposes of tortious interference with business expectancies claim; whether policies underlying res judicata supported its application in present case.</i>	
Williams v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	990
Williams v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	996
Williams v. Housing Authority	338
<i>Negligence; recklessness; statutory (§ 52-557n) governmental immunity; summary judgment; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that there was genuine issue of material fact as to whether municipal defendants' failure to inspect decedents' apartment for compliance with applicable fire safety codes and regulations, as required by statute (§ 29-305), constituted reckless disregard for health or safety under § 52-557n (b) (8); clarification of standard that governs reckless disregard exception in § 52-557n (b) (8), discussed.</i>	
Wilson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	993
Zhang v. 56 Locust Road, LLC (Order)	986