

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 331

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Anderson v. Dike (Order)	910
Bank of America, National Assn. v. Liebskind (Order)	907
Becue v. Becue (Order)	902
Boria v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	902
Boucher v. Saint Francis GI Endoscopy, LLC (Order)	905
Bruno v. Whipple (Order)	911
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
Connecticut Community Bank, N.A. v. Kiernan (Order)	911
Costello v. Goldstein & Peck, P.C. (Order)	908
Deutsche Bank AG v. Sebastian Holdings, Inc.	379
<i>Enforcement of foreign judgment; summary judgment; res judicata; collateral estoppel; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that plaintiff's corporate veil piercing claim was not barred by res judicata; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that individual defendant was not collaterally estopped from denying liability for foreign judgment rendered against defendant corporation.</i>	
Federal National Mortgage Assn. v. Buhl (Order)	906
Fingelly v. Fairfield (Order)	904
Gabriel v. Mount Vernon Fire Ins. Co. (Order)	903
Gould v. Stamford	289
<i>Workers' compensation; single-member limited liability companies; denial and dismissal of claim for concurrent employment benefits pursuant to provision (§ 31-310) of Workers' Compensation Act (§ 31-275 et seq.) by Workers' Compensation Commissioner; appeal to Compensation Review Board; board's affirmance of commissioner's decision; whether board, in upholding commissioner's decision, properly reasoned that, because limited liability company of which plaintiff was only member allegedly did not maintain appropriate corporate formalities, its status as limited liability company had to be disregarded; whether chairman of Workers' Compensation Commission had authority to adopt conclusive presumption that members of single-member limited liability companies are not their employees for purposes of act; whether board incorrectly concluded that plaintiff was not employee of limited liability company and, therefore, was not entitled to concurrent employment benefits pursuant to § 31-310.</i>	
Ham v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	904
Hodges v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	912
In re Tresin J. (Order)	909
Jacobson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	901
Karagozian v. USV Optical, Inc. (Order)	904
Margarita O. v. Irazu (Order)	908
Raspberry Junction Holding, LLC v. Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority	364
<i>Negligence; summary judgment; claim that defendant water authority, as municipal corporation engaged in proprietary function, was not immune from liability and had no authority, express or implied, to promulgate rules limiting its liability for negligence; claim that, if defendant had such authority, rule limiting liability would not be reasonable exercise of authority because defendant was not subject to regulations that might otherwise circumscribe its ability to set rates to cover liability costs.</i>	
Rivera v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	901

Smith v. Commissioner of Correction (Order). 912

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. Brown 258

Burglary; larceny; conspiracy; attempt; criminal mischief; criminal trover; possession of burglar tools; motions to suppress; motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss on basis of its conclusion that state obtained defendant's prospective and historical cell phone data from his telecommunications carrier in violation of statute ([Rev. to 2009] § 54-47aa); application of fourth amendment principles relating to disclosure of certain cell phone data set forth in United States Supreme Court's decision in Carpenter v. United States (138 S. Ct. 2206), discussed; whether suppression of cell phone data was appropriate remedy when records were obtained in violation of defendant's fourth amendment rights and in violation of § 54-47aa; whether good faith exception to exclusionary rule was applicable to unconstitutional disclosure of historical cell phone data; whether trial court correctly determined that state failed to meet its burden of proving that inevitable discovery doctrine was applicable, under facts of case, to witness' statement to police and potential trial testimony implicating defendant in charged crimes.

State v. Bumgarner-Ramos (Order)	910
State v. Carey (Order)	913
State v. Daniel B.	1
<i>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.</i>	
State v. Davis.	239
<i>Criminal possession of pistol; carrying pistol without permit; conditional plea of nolo contendere; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to suppress handgun that gave rise to charges against defendant; whether anonymous 911 call in which caller claimed to have seen young man with handgun was sufficient to give rise to reasonable suspicion that defendant had been engaged in criminal activity; factors for determining whether anonymous tip has sufficient indicia of reliability under Navarette v. California (572 U.S. 393), discussed.</i>	
State v. Fernando V.	201
<i>Sexual assault second degree; risk of injury to child; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly determined that trial court had abused its discretion in precluding testimony of complainant's boyfriend regarding complainant's behavior on ground that such testimony was cumulative of other evidence presented at trial; reviewability of state's unpreserved claim that testimony of complainant's boyfriend was properly excluded; whether improper exclusion of witness' testimony was harmless error when case turned solely on credibility of complainant's testimony.</i>	
State v. Jones (Order)	909
State v. Joseph B. (Order)	908
State v. Juarez (Order)	910
State v. Patel (Order)	906
State v. Purcell.	318
<i>Risk of injury to child; motion to suppress; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that defendant's statements made during custodial interrogation did not constitute clear and unequivocal invocation of his right to counsel under standard set forth in Davis v. United States (512 U.S. 452); ambiguous or equivocal requests for counsel, discussed; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that article first, § 8, of Connecticut constitution did not require police officers to cease questioning immediately and to clarify defendant's ambiguous or equivocal request for counsel during custodial interrogation.</i>	
State v. Rivera (Order)	911
State v. Santiago (Order)	902
Trocki v. Borusiewicz (Order)	907
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Wolf (Order)	901
Wethersfield v. PR Arrow, LLC (Order)	907