

**Cumulative Table of Cases**  
**Connecticut Reports**  
**Volume 332**

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Bank of America, N.A. v. Grogins (Order) . . . . .   | 902 |
| Benjamin v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .   | 906 |
| Boisvert v. Gavis. . . . .   | 115 |
| <i>Third-party petition for visitation; motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that defendant's postjudgment offer of visitation deprived court of subject matter jurisdiction; whether defendant established that his post-judgment offer of visitation was made in good faith and with intention of allowing visitation; whether trial court's contempt order was void for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that statute (§ 46b-59) implicitly required trial court to include provision in visitation order directing third party to abide by fit parent's decisions regarding minor child's care during visitation; claim that due process clause compels trial court ordering third-party visitation to include provision requiring third party to abide by all of fit parent's decisions regarding minor child's care during visitation; whether § 46b-59 was unconstitutional as applied to facts of case; reviewability of claim that amount of visitation ordered by trial court violated defendant's fundamental parental rights under due process clause of fourteenth amendment to United States constitution.</i> |     |
| Brewer v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .   | 903 |
| Cancel v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .   | 908 |
| Deroy v. Reck (Order) . . . . .  | 907 |
| Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Speer (Order) . . . . .  | 907 |
| Doe v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services (Order) . . . . .   | 901 |
| Fiano v. Old Saybrook Fire Co. No. 1, Inc. . . . .   | 93  |
| <i>Negligence; summary judgment; vicarious liability; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly upheld trial court's granting of summary judgment in favor of defendant fire company and defendant town on ground that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether individual defendant was acting within scope of his employment with fire company at time of motor vehicle accident giving rise to plaintiff's action; claim that individual defendant, by being in close proximity to fire company's premises, provided benefit to fire company; interplay between workers' compensation law and doctrine of respondeat superior, discussed.</i>  |     |
| Fields v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .   | 904 |
| Fletcher v. Lieberman (Order) . . . . .  | 909 |
| Gaffney v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .  | 903 |
| Geriatrics, Inc. v. McGee . . . . .  | 1   |
| <i>Breach of contract; claim under Connecticut Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act (CUFTA) (§ 52-552a et seq.); unjust enrichment; agency principles in context of power of attorney, discussed; whether trial court improperly rejected plaintiff's fraudulent transfer claim on ground that defendant's transfer of debtor's assets pursuant to power of attorney was not transfer made by debtor under CUFTA; whether trial court improperly failed to consider agency relationship between defendants and to apply agency principles in its analysis of plaintiff's CUFTA claim; whether trial court improperly rendered judgment for defendant on plaintiff's unjust enrichment claim.</i>  |     |
| Girolametti v. Michael Horton Associates, Inc. . . . .   | 67  |
| <i>Construction; arbitration; res judicata; privity; summary judgment; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly reversed trial court's denial of defendant subcontractors' motions for summary judgment on ground that defendant subcontractors were in privity with defendant general contractor for purposes of res judicata; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that plaintiffs' claims were barred by res judicata because they could have been raised during prior arbitration between plaintiffs and general contractor; whether Appellate Court properly adopted rebuttable presumption that subcontractors are in privity with general contractor on construction project for purposes of res judi-</i>   |     |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <i>cata; claim that application of presumption of privity would be unfair; claim that Appellate Court improperly concluded, on basis of parties' contractual relationships, that defendant subcontractors were in privity with general contractor; claim that presumption of privity was ill suited for complexities of commercial construction industry; whether presumption of privity should apply under facts of present case; claim that Appellate Court's conclusion that general contractor was in privity with defendant subcontractors was inconsistent with arbitrator's factual finding that contract did not obligate general contractor to perform or to be responsible for all design and engineering aspects of construction project.</i> |     |
| Girolametti v. VP Buildings, Inc. (See Girolametti v. Michael Horton Associates, Inc.) . . .   | 67  |
| Guijarro v. Antes (Order) . . . . .  | 901 |
| Harvey v. Department of Correction (Order) . . . . .   | 905 |
| In re Probate Appeal of Fumega-Serrano (Order) . . . . .   | 906 |
| Northrup v. Witkowski . . . . .  | 158 |
| <i>Negligence; claim that municipal defendants' failure to properly repair and maintain municipal catch basin caused flooding of plaintiffs' property; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court properly had granted motion for summary judgment filed by defendants on basis of governmental immunity; whether municipal duties with respect to storm drainage system are ministerial or discretionary in nature; Spitzer v. Waterbury (113 Conn. 84), to extent that it held that repair and maintenance of municipally owned drainage systems are ministerial rather than discretionary functions, overruled.</i>   |     |
| Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel v. Miller (Order) . . . . .   | 908 |
| Praisner v. State (Order) . . . . .  | 905 |
| Presidential Village, LLC v. Perkins . . . . .   | 45  |
| <i>Summary process; motion to dismiss; certification from Appellate Court; whether inclusion of undesignated charges for obligations other than rent in pretermination notice that asserted only nonpayment of rent as ground for termination of tenancy in federally subsidized housing rendered notice jurisdictionally defective; whether Appellate Court improperly reversed trial court's judgment of dismissal; claim that defect in pretermination notice was not jurisdictional; federal regulations (24 C.F.R. § 247) governing use and occupancy of federally subsidized housing and their relationship to protection of low income tenants, discussed.</i>  |     |
| State v. Bethea (Order) . . . . .  | 904 |
| State v. Gonzalez (Order) . . . . .  | 901 |
| State v. Montanez (Order) . . . . .  | 907 |
| Sutera v. Natiello (Order) . . . . .   | 908 |
| U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Kupczyk (Order) . . . . .  | 904 |
| U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Robles (Order) . . . . .   | 906 |
| Williams v. State (Order) . . . . .  | 902 |
| Wilmington Trust Co. v. Bachelder (Order) . . . . .  | 903 |
| Yuille v. Parnoff (Order) . . . . .  | 902 |