

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 330

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Gause (Order)	940
Abrams v. PH Architects, LLC (Order)	925
Adams v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles (Order)	940
Adkins v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	946
Akers v. University of Connecticut Law School (Order)	902
Amelio v. Monthie (Orders)	907
Angersola v. Radiologic Associates of Middletown, P.C.	251
<i>Wrongful death action pursuant to statute (§ 52-555); motions to dismiss plaintiffs' action on ground that plaintiffs failed to commence action within five year repose period set forth in § 52-555; motion for limited discovery of disputed facts related to trial court's jurisdiction; claim that repose period of § 52-555 had been tolled as to all defendants in accordance with continuing course of conduct and continuing course of treatment doctrines; whether trial court correctly determined that failure to comply with repose provision of § 52-555 deprives trial court of subject matter jurisdiction over action brought pursuant to that statute; claim that plaintiffs could not invoke continuing course of conduct and continuing course of treatment doctrines as basis for extending repose period set forth in § 52-555; whether plaintiffs properly preserved their claim for evidentiary hearing to address disputed issues of fact in support of their tolling claims; whether trial court correctly concluded that record did not support application of continuing course of treatment doctrine; whether trial court properly denied plaintiffs' request for limited discovery or for evidentiary hearing before it ruled on motions to dismiss, in order to resolve disputed jurisdictional facts related to claim that repose period of § 52-555 was tolled by continuing course of conduct doctrine.</i>	
Bank of America, N.A. v. Kydes (Order)	925
Bank of America, N.A. v. Nino (Order)	927
Bank of New York Mellon v. Gilmore (Order)	926
Bank of New York Mellon v. Horsey (Order)	928
Bank of New York Mellon v. Orlando (Order)	952
Banks v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	950
Barker v. All Roofs by Dominic (Order)	925
Battistotti v. Suzanne A. (Order)	904
Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC v. Park City Sports, LLC (Order)	901
Bell v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	949
Bennett v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	910
Bongiorno v. Capone (Order)	943
Breton v. Commissioner of Correction	462
<i>Habeas corpus; risk reduction credit; claim that 2013 amendment (P.A. 13-3, § 59) to statute ([Rev. to 2013] § 54-125a) governing parole eligibility, as applied retroactively to petitioner, violated ex post facto clause of United States constitution on ground that it increased amount of time that he would be required to serve before becoming eligible for parole; whether ex post facto clause barred respondent from applying 2013 amendment to petitioner; whether 2013 amendment created sufficient risk that petitioner would be incarcerated longer than he would have been under version of § 54-125a in effect when petitioner committed crimes for which he was incarcerated.</i>	
Browning v. Van Brunt, DuBiago & Co., LLC	447
<i>Breach of contract; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that plaintiffs, as trust beneficiaries, lacked standing to assert breach of contract claim against certain defendants on ground that trustee is appropriate party to bring action against third parties for liability to trust; whether plaintiffs fit within exception to general rule providing that beneficiaries may bring claim against third parties if trustee improperly refused or improperly neglected to bring action on behalf of trust; whether motion to dismiss was proper vehicle to challenge plaintiffs' standing to assert their breach of contract claim.</i>	

Cady v. Zoning Board of Appeals	502
<i>Zoning; subdivisions; whether trial court improperly reversed decision of defendant zoning board of appeals upholding decision of defendant zoning enforcement officer approving certain property line revisions proposed by defendant landowner; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that landowner's proposal constituted subdivision as defined by statute (§ 8-18); whether trial court properly applied provision of Burlington Zoning Regulations (§ III.F.7) governing establishment of nonconforming uses on preexisting lots.</i>	
Carolina v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	943
Chamerda v. Opie (Order)	953
Chance v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	934
Clements v. Aramark Corp. (Order)	904
Commissioner of Emergency Services & Public Protection v. Freedom of Information Commission	372
<i>Freedom of information; administrative appeal; whether trial court properly sustained plaintiffs' appeal from decision of named defendant, Freedom of Information Commission, ordering disclosure of certain documents lawfully seized by police; whether trial court correctly concluded that documents were exempt from disclosure under Freedom of Information Act (§ 1-200 et seq.); claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that statutes (§§ 54-33a through 54-36p) governing searches and seizures by police satisfied requirements for statutory (§ 1-210 [a]) exception for contrary state laws; burden of proving exemptions from disclosure under act, discussed; claim that judgment of trial court could be affirmed on alternative ground that documents did not constitute public records under act.</i>	
Connecticut National Mortgage Co. v. Knudsen (Order)	926
Conroy v. Idlibi (Order)	921
DAB Three, LLC v. LandAmerica Financial Group, Inc. (Order)	921
Dahle v. Stop & Shop Supermarket Co., LLC (Order)	953
Desmond v. Yale-New Haven Hospital, Inc. (Order)	902
Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	954
Dish Network, LLC v. Commissioner of Revenue Services	280
<i>Tax appeal; claim that plaintiff satellite video company's failure to request administrative review of audit pursuant to statute (§ 12-268i) barred subsequent request for refund pertaining to same tax period; whether trial court correctly concluded that gross earnings from sale, lease, installation, and maintenance of equipment were taxable pursuant to statute (§ 12-256 [b] [2]); whether trial court correctly concluded that gross earnings from digital video recording services and payment related fees were not taxable pursuant to § 12-256 (b) (2); whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiff was not entitled to interest on refund pursuant to statute (§ 12-268c [b] [1]).</i>	
Doe v. Bemer (Order)	931
Drabik v. Thomas (Order)	929
Dupigny v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	942
Farrell v. Johnson & Johnson (Order)	944
Filosì v. Electric Boat Corp.	231
<i>Workers' compensation; collateral estoppel; claim for benefits under state Workers' Compensation Act (§ 31-275 et seq.) by plaintiff, who had been awarded benefits under federal Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. § 901 et seq.) following husband's death from lung cancer that allegedly was caused by workplace asbestos exposure; whether finding by administrative law judge in prior federal proceeding that decedent's workplace exposure to asbestos was substantial contributing cause of development of his lung cancer precluded defendant employer and defendant insurers from contesting issue of causation under state act; claim by defendants that they were not collaterally estopped from litigating causal connection between decedent's death and his workplace exposure to asbestos because federal act requires lower standard of causation than substantial factor standard required under state act.</i>	
Finney v. Finney (Order)	955
Francis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	903
Garner v. Commissioner of Correction	486
<i>Habeas corpus; risk reduction credit; claim that 2013 amendment (P.A. 13-3, § 59) to statute ([Rev. to 2013] § 54-125a) governing parole eligibility, as applied retroactively to petitioner, violated ex post facto clause of United States constitution on ground that it increased amount of time that he would be required to serve before becoming eligible for parole; whether ex post facto clause barred</i>	

<i>respondent from applying 2013 amendment to petitioner; petitioner's ex post facto claim controlled by this court's decision in Breton v. Commissioner of Correction (330 Conn. 462); claim that petitioner's counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to arrange for petitioner's cousin to speak on petitioner's behalf at sentencing hearing in mitigation of petitioner's sentence; whether counsel's performance was deficient.</i>	
Georges v. OB-GYN Services, P.C. (Order)	905
Gonzalez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	947
Graham v. Commissioner of Transportation	400
<i>Highway defect statute (§ 13a-144); personal injury; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly reversed trial court's judgment in favor of defendant Commissioner of Transportation; claim that commissioner was liable under § 13a-144 for failure of state police to close interstate bridge because of icy conditions; whether evidence in record was sufficient to establish relationship between state police and commissioner, as required under Lamb v. Burns (202 Conn. 158); construction of statutes waiving sovereign immunity, discussed.</i>	
Greene v. Commissioner of Correction	1
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that prosecutor's failure to correct allegedly false testimony pertaining to plea agreement for cooperating witness deprived petitioner of right to due process of law; recommendation for conducting examinations of cooperating witnesses with respect to plea agreements, discussed; claim that state violated petitioner's right to due process on ground that prosecutor knew before petitioner's criminal trial, but failed to disclose, intention to recommend favorable sentence for cooperating witness; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying petitioner's request to issue capias.</i>	
Green v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	933
Grover v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	933
Hall v. Hall (Order)	911
Hamburg v. Hamburg (Order)	916
Hartford v. CBV Parking Hartford, LLC	200
<i>Eminent domain; challenge to statement of compensation filed by plaintiff city; claim that city's appeal was moot because it challenged only one of two independent grounds that supported trial court's fair market value determination; whether trial court improperly valued property on basis of unreasonable assumption that defendants would assemble their parcels with adjoining properties owned by city for development; whether trial court improperly awarded interest pursuant to statute (§ 37-3c) at rate of 7.22 percent and offer of compromise interest.</i>	
Hilario's Truck Center, LLC v. Rinaldi (Order)	925
Hirsch v. Woermer (Order)	938
HSBC Bank USA, N.A. v. Orlando (Order)	952
Hum v. Silvester (Order)	919
Humble v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	939
In re Aalanah M. (Order)	935
In re James H. (Order) (See In re Katherine H.)	906
In re Katherine H. (Order)	906
In re Madison M. (Order)	951
In re Zoey H. (Order)	906
Jenkins v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	949
Jenzack Partners, LLC v. Stoneridge Associates, LLC (Orders)	921, 922
Jordan v. Biller (Order)	941
Kaminski v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	939
Kaplan v. Scheer (Order)	913
Keller v. Keller (Order)	939
Krahl v. Czoch (Order)	927
Kuehl v. Koskoff (Order)	919
Landmark Development Group, LLC v. Water & Sewer Commission (Orders)	937
Langston v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	946
Ledyard v. WMS Gaming, Inc.	75
<i>Personal property taxes; attorney's fees; final judgment; appellate jurisdiction; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over defendant's appeal from trial court's decision to grant plaintiff town's motion for summary judgment as to liability only; claim that Appellate Court improperly dismissed appeal by relying on footnote in Paranteau v. DeVita</i>	

<i>(208 Conn. 515); whether Appellate Court improperly failed to apply bright line rule from Paranteau that judgment on merits is final for purposes of appeal even though amount of attorney's fees had not yet been determined.</i>	
Lewis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	906
Lindsay v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	947
Marshall v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	949
Melendez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	954
Mercado v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	918
Moore v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	954
Murallo v. United Builders Supply Co. (Order)	913
Murray v. Suffield Police Dept. (Order)	902
Nationstar Mortgage, LLC v. Washington (Order)	943
Nichols v. Oxford (Order)	912
136 Field Point Circle Holding Co., LLC v. Razinski (Order)	942
Oztemel v. Bailey (Order)	923
Palosz v. Greenwich (Order)	930
Randazzo v. Sakon (Order)	909
Real Estate Mortgage Network, Inc. v. Squillante (Order)	950
Roberson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	948
St. Juste v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	917
Santos v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	955
Saunders v. KDFBS, LLC (Order)	915
Seaside National Bank & Trust v. Lussier (Order)	951
Seven Oaks Enterprises, L.P. v. DeVito (Order)	953
Smith v. Rudolph	138
<i>Action pursuant to statute (§ 52-556) waiving sovereign immunity when person is injured due to negligence of state employee while that employee is operating motor vehicle owned and insured by state; right to jury trial; motion to strike case from jury trial list; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that § 52-556 did not afford plaintiff right to jury trial; whether trial court properly struck plaintiff's case from jury trial list; whether § 52-556 expressly provides for right to jury trial.</i>	
Standard Petroleum Co. v. Faugno Acquisition, LLC	40
<i>Class action; claim that defendant petroleum company, which supplied gasoline products to plaintiff service station operators and franchisees, overcharged them by failing to apply certain federal tax credit and by charging state gross receipts tax; claim under Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); motions for class certification; standards that govern trial court's class certification decision, discussed; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that four prerequisites to class action set forth in applicable rule of practice (§ 9-7) were satisfied; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that common issues of law and fact predominated and that class action was superior to other methods of adjudication.</i>	
Stanley v. Grant (Order)	955
State v. Bagnaschi (Order)	907
State v. Baldwin (Order)	922
State v. Bischoff (Order)	912
State v. Carney (Order)	945
State v. Corver (Order)	916
State v. Covington (Order)	933
State v. Crosby (Order)	911
State v. Day (Order)	924
State v. Dubuisson (Order)	914
State v. Durdek (Order)	934
State v. Ezequiel R. R. (Order)	945
State v. Fletcher (Order)	918
State v. Gerald A. (Order)	914
State v. Griffin (Orders)	941
State v. Harper (Order)	936
State v. Harris	91
<i>Felony murder; robbery first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery first degree; eyewitness identifications; motion to suppress; out-of-court identification of defendant by eyewitness to crimes at arraignment on unrelated charges; claim that trial court violated defendant's due process rights under federal constitution by denying his motion to suppress eyewitness' out-of-court and in-court identifi-</i>	

<i>cations of him because out-of-court identification was product of unnecessarily suggestive procedure and neither identification was reliable; claim that, even if defendant's federal constitutional rights were not violated, admission of those identifications violated defendant's due process rights under state constitution; whether defendant was entitled to suppression of out-of-court and in-court identifications under federal constitution; whether identification procedure was unnecessarily suggestive; whether identification of defendant at arraignment proceeding was nevertheless reliable under totality of circumstances; modification of framework for determining reliability of identifications set forth in Neil v. Biggers (409 U.S. 188) to conform to recent developments in social science and law, as matter of state constitutional law; endorsement of factors that this court identified as matter of state evidentiary law in State v. Guilbert (306 Conn. 218) for determining reliability of identifications; adoption of burden shifting framework that New Jersey Supreme Court articulated in State v. Henderson (208 N.J. 208) for purposes of allocating burden of proof with respect to admissibility of identification that is product of unnecessarily suggestive identification procedure; claim that, if trial court had applied standard that this court adopted for purposes of state constitution in present case, it would have concluded that identification should be excluded as insufficiently unreliable.</i>	
State v. Harris (Order)	918
State v. Hearl (Order)	903
State v. Holmes (Order)	913
State v. Jackson (Order)	922
State v. Jackson (Order)	937
State v. Jerzy G. (Order)	932
State v. Lamantia (Order)	919
State v. Latour (Order)	927
State v. Liebenguth (Order)	901
State v. Meadows (Order)	947
State v. McKethan (Order)	931
State v. Morice W. (Order)	929
State v. Newton	344
<i>Illegal practices in campaign financing; claim that trial court improperly instructed jury as to mens rea required to prove crime of illegal practices in campaign financing; whether defendant waived unreserved instructional challenge; meaning of phrase "knowingly and wilfully," as used in penalty statute (§ 9-623) for crime of illegal practices in campaign financing, discussed; instruction that court was required to give jury for it to determine whether defendant was guilty of crime of illegal practices in campaign financing, discussed.</i>	
State v. Ortiz (Order)	920
State v. Papantoniou (Order)	948
State v. Papineau (Order)	916
State v. Petitpas (Order)	929
State v. Ramos (Order)	917
State v. Raynor (Order)	910
State v. Reservation Services International, Inc. (Order)	915
State v. Ruiz-Pacheco (Order)	938
State v. Sherman (Order)	936
State v. Smith (Orders)	908, 914
State v. Stephenson (Order)	908
State v. Taupier	149
<i>Threatening first degree; breach of peace second degree; disorderly conduct; motion to dismiss; claim that threatening statements directed toward Superior Court judge in e-mail sent to others constituted protected speech under federal and state constitutions; claim that first degree threatening statute (§ 53a-61aa [a] [3]) was unconstitutional under free speech provisions of federal and state constitutions because statute did not require state to prove that defendant, in threatening to commit crime of violence, had specific intent to terrorize target of threatening statements; claim that first amendment requires higher mens rea for threatening speech directed at public official; whether trial court's consideration of evidence regarding certain events following defendant's threatening statement constituted reversible error; whether evidence was sufficient to support defendant's convictions of threatening in first degree and disorderly conduct; indirect communication of threats through third parties, discussed.</i>	
State v. Turner (Order)	909

State v. Vassell (Order)	935
State v. Vega (Order)	928
State v. White (Order)	924
State v. Williams (Order)	935
State v. Wynne (Order)	911
Stephenson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	931
Sun Val, LLC v. Commissioner of Transportation	316
<i>Negligence; claim that trial court improperly considered certain regulations govern-</i>	
<i>ing remediation; claim that trial court improperly failed to adopt removal plan</i>	
<i>proposed by expert witness; claim that trial court's award of damages was insuffi-</i>	
<i>cient; whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiff landowner failed to</i>	
<i>mitigate damages resulting from deposit of material on plaintiff's property;</i>	
<i>whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiff had failed to prove element</i>	
<i>of proximate causation with respect to claim for lost profits.</i>	
Suntech of Connecticut, Inc. v. Lawrence Brunoli, Inc.	342
<i>Breach of contract; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court cor-</i>	
<i>rectly concluded that trial court did not commit harmful error by precluding</i>	
<i>testimony from plaintiff's fact witness as to certain observations and perceptions</i>	
<i>or by declining to permit plaintiff's offer of proof; appeal dismissed on ground</i>	
<i>that certification was improvidently granted.</i>	
Szymonik v. Szymonik (Order)	924
Taylor v. Taylor (Order)	932
Tedesco v. Agoli (Order)	905
Thompson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	930
Traylor v. Gambrell (Order)	901
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Brouillard (Order)	944
Ugalde v. Saint Mary's Hospital, Inc. (Order)	928
Walenski v. Connecticut State Employees Retirement Commission (Order)	951
Walsh v. Bemer (Order)	932
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Lorson (Order)	920
White v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	904
Wiggins v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	942
Wilson v. Wilson (Order)	956
Zilkha v. Zilkha (Order)	913