

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 333

| | |
|--|-----|
| Adams v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 910 |
| Barry A. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 905 |
| Bozelko v. Statewide Construction, Inc. (Order) | 901 |
| Cohen v. Statewide Grievance Committee (Order) | 901 |
| Connecticut Interlocal Risk Management Agency v. Jackson | 206 |
| <i>Negligence; summary judgment; proof of causation; application of alternative liability doctrine when conduct of multiple defendants is tortious and plaintiff's injuries have been caused by conduct of only one defendant but it is unclear which one; claim that trial court improperly failed to apply alternative liability doctrine in granting defendants' motions for summary judgment; application of alternative liability rule pursuant to which plaintiff's burden of proving causation shifts to each defendant to show that he or she did not cause plaintiff's injuries; elements required for application of alternative liability doctrine, discussed; whether application of doctrine to defendants in present case was unfair or compromised any legitimate reliance interest that they may have had.</i> | |
| Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Siladi (Order) | 902 |
| Francis v. Board of Pardon & Paroles (Order) | 907 |
| Goodwin Estate Assn., Inc. v. Starke (Order) | 912 |
| Jackson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 904 |
| Jordan v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 905 |
| King v. Volvo Excavators AB | 3 |
| <i>Product liability; whether trial court properly granted defendants' motions for summary judgment on ground that plaintiff's claims were barred by applicable statute of repose (§ 52-577a [a]); claim that amendment to § 52-577a (P.A. 17-97) applied retroactively to plaintiff's claims.</i> | |
| Metcalf v. Fitzgerald. | 1 |
| <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> | |
| Outing v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 903 |
| Rausser v. Pitney Bowes, Inc. (Order) | 903 |
| Riley v. Travelers Home & Marine Ins. Co. | 60 |
| <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> | |
| Roger R. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 904 |
| St. Denis-Lima v. St. Denis (Order) | 910 |
| Santa Energy Corp. v. Santa (Order) | 910 |
| Sena v. American Medical Response of Connecticut, Inc. | 30 |
| <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> | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| State v. Abdus-Sabur (Order) | 911 |
| State v. Ayala | 225 |
| <i>Murder; conspiracy to commit murder; claim that trial court improperly admitted evidence of statement made by gang leader under coconspirator hearsay exception; whether defendant demonstrated that trial court's admission of testimony regarding gang leader's statement substantially affected verdict; whether trial court improperly admitted testimony regarding victim's statement about his fear of gang as state of mind evidence.</i> | |
| State v. Dawson (Order) | 906 |
| State v. Elmer G. | 176 |
| <i>Sexual assault second degree; risk of injury to child; criminal violation of restraining order; certification from Appellate Court; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of criminal violation of restraining order; claim that trial court's explanation of temporary restraining order was unclear such that jury could not reasonably determine that defendant knew he was prohibited from contacting his children outside of weekly, supervised visits; claim that defendant was not adequately informed in his primary language that he was prohibited from contacting children by text or letter; claim that defendant did not violate restraining order when he sent letter to victim because evidence was insufficient to establish that he sent letter while restraining order was in effect; claim that defendant was deprived of fair trial as result of certain alleged improprieties committed by prosecutor; claim that prosecutor improperly bolstered credibility of certain witnesses; claim that prosecutor made golden rule argument when he asked jurors to consider their own perspectives; claim that prosecutor improperly referred to victim's credibility in light of psychological, social and physical barriers she faced in accusing defendant of sexual assault; claim that prosecutor improperly asked jurors whether other individuals in similar circumstances would fabricate sexual assault accusations.</i> | |
| State v. Fernandes (Order) | 908 |
| State v. Francis (Order) | 912 |
| State v. Leniart. | 88 |
| <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 State v. Porter (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> | |
| State v. Ramon A. G. (Order) | 909 |
| State v. Robert H. | 172 |
| <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 State v. Leniart (333 Conn. 88).</i> | |
| State v. Rodriguez (Order) | 908 |
| State v. Sanchez (Order) | 907 |
| State v. Slaughter (Order) | 908 |
| State v. Thigpen (Order) | 909 |
| State v. Thompson (Order) | 906 |
| TPF Development Corp. v. R & R Pool & Home, Inc. (Order) | 906 |
| U.S. Bank Trust, N.A. v. Giblen (Order) | 903 |
| Vassell v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 911 |
| Viking Construction, Inc. v. 777 Residential, LLC (Order) | 904 |
| Villafane v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 902 |
| Vitti v. Milford (Order) | 902 |