

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 333

<p>Metcalf v. Fitzgerald</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Vexatious litigation; Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); whether trial court properly dismissed state law claims alleging vexatious litigation and violation of CUTPA for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's state law claims; whether plaintiff's state law claims were expressly preempted by federal Bankruptcy Code; whether plaintiff's state law claims were implicitly preempted by federal Bankruptcy Code; claim that Congress did not intend to occupy field of sanctions and remedies for abuse of bankruptcy process; claim that plaintiff's state law claims were not preempted because remedies under Connecticut law and federal law are different.</i></p>	1
<p>Riley v. Travelers Home & Marine Ins. Co.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Breach of contract; negligent infliction of emotional distress; motion for directed verdict pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 16-37); applicability of waiver rule; whether evidence was sufficient to support jury's verdict with respect to plaintiff's claim of negligent infliction of emotional distress; reviewability of claim that waiver rule is inapplicable in civil cases in which trial court reserved decision on motion for directed verdict; claim that trial court was limited to considering evidence adduced in plaintiff's case-in-chief when it ruled on defendant's motion for judgment notwithstanding verdict.</i></p>	60
<p>Sena v. American Medical Response of Connecticut, Inc.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Negligence; whether trial court's denial of defendant city's motion for summary judgment claiming immunity pursuant to statute (§ 28-13) governing liability of political subdivisions for actions taken in response to civil preparedness emergencies constituted final judgment for purpose of appeal; nature of immunity provided to political subdivisions under § 28-13, discussed; whether trial court improperly denied city's motion for summary judgment; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether emergency continued to exist at time of alleged negligence.</i></p>	30
<p>State v. Leniart</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Capital felony; murder; certification from Appellate Court; whether unpreserved sufficiency claim under state common-law corpus delicti rule was reviewable on appeal; whether there was sufficient, corroborating evidence, independent of defendant's confessions, to sustain defendant's conviction; purpose, history, and scope of corpus delicti rule, discussed; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court's improper exclusion of video recording depicting polygraph pretest interview constituted harmful error; definition of categorically inadmissible polygraph evidence under <i>State v. Porter</i> (241 Conn. 57), discussed; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had abused its discretion in excluding expert testimony regarding credibility of incarcerated informants.</i></p>	88
<p>State v. Robert H.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Risk of injury to child; violation of probation; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that corpus delicti is rule of admissibility; resolution of defendant's claim controlled by this court's decision in <i>State v. Leniart</i> (333 Conn. 88).</i></p>	172