Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 331

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Becue *v.* Becue (Order) . . . 902
Boria *v.* Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . 902
Boucher *v.* Saint Francis GI Endoscopy, LLC (Order) . . . 905
Buie *v.* Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . 905
Cannatelli *v.* Statewide Grievance Committee (Order) . . . 903
Citibank, N.A., Trustee *v.* Stein (Order) . . . 903
CitiMortgage, Inc. *v.* Pritchard (Order) . . . 906
Fingelly v. Fairfield (Order) . . . 904
Gabriel *v.* Mount Vernon Fire Ins. Co. (Order) . . . 903
Ham *v.* Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . 904
Jacobson *v.* Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . 901
Karagozian *v.* USV Optical, Inc. (Order) . . . 904
Rivera *v.* Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . 901
Soto *v.* Bushmaster Firearms International, LLC . . . 53

Wrongful death action pursuant to statute (§ 52-555) against defendant manufacturers, distributors, and sellers of semiautomatic rifle used in school shooting; claim that defendants negligently entrusted to civilian consumers assault rifle that is suitable for use only by military and law enforcement personnel; claim that defendants violated Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.) through sale or wrongful marketing of rifle; motion to strike plaintiffs' complaint; claim that all of plaintiffs' claims were barred by Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act (PLCAA) (15 U.S.C. §§ 7901 through 7903 [2012]); whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiffs did not plead legally sufficient cause of action based on negligent entrustment under state common law; whether trial court improperly struck plaintiffs' claims under CUTPA on ground that plaintiffs lacked standing because they were third-party victims who did not have consumer or commercial relationship with defendants; claim that prudential concerns supported restriction of CUTPA standing to persons who have direct business relationship with alleged wrongdoer; whether statute of limitations applicable to wrongful death claims or whether statute of limitations applicable to CUTPA claims applied to cause of action for wrongful death predicated on CUTPA violation; whether plaintiffs' wrongful death claims predicated on theory that any sale of military style assault weapons, such as rifle in question, represented unfair trade practice were time barred; whether plaintiffs' wrongful death claims predicated on theory that defendants violated CUTPA by advertising and marketing rifle in unethical, oppressive, immoral, and unscrupulous manner were time barred; claim, as alternative ground for affirming trial court's judgment, that exclusivity provision of Connecticut Product Liability Act (§ 52-572n [a]) barred plaintiffs' CUTPA claims that were predicated on defendants' allegedly wrongful advertising and marketing of rifle; whether personal injuries resulting in death that are alleged to have resulted directly from wrongful advertising and marketing practices are cognizable under CUTPA; whether PLCAA barred plaintiffs' wrongful death claims predicated on theory that defendants violated CUTPA by marketing rifle in question to civilians for criminal purposes; whether trial court correctly concluded that CUTPA, as applied to plaintiffs' allegations, fell within PLCAA's "predicate" exception to immunity for civil actions alleging that firearms manufacturer or seller knowingly violated state or federal statute "applicable" to "sale or marketing" of firearms, and violation was proximate cause of harm for which relief was sought; review of text of predicate exception and legislative history of PLCAA to determine whether Congress intended to preclude actions alleging that firearms manufacturer or seller violated state consumer protection laws by promoting its firearms for illegal, criminal purposes; whether CUTPA qualified as predicate statute under PLCAA insofar as it applied to wrongful advertising and marketing claims; whether congressional statement of findings and purposes set forth in PLCAA lent support for this

court's conclusion that Congress did not intend PLCAA to preclude plaintiffs' wrongful advertising and marketing claims brought pursuant to CUTPA; whether construing statute of general applicability such as CUTPA to be predicate statute would lead to absurd results; whether extrinsic indicia of congressional intent supported conclusion that CUTPA, as applied to plaintiffs' claims, qualified as predicate statute under PLCAA.

State *v.* Daniel B. 1

Attempt to commit murder; certification from Appellate Court; sufficiency of evidence; whether Appellate Court properly construed substantial step subdivision of attempt statute (§ 53a-49 [a] [2]) to require inquiry to focus on what already has been done rather than on what remains to be done to complete the substantive crime in determining whether defendant's conduct constituted substantial step in course of conduct planned to culminate in his commission of murder.

State *v.* Santiago (Order) 902

U.S. Bank National Assn. *v.* Wolf (Order) 901