

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 334

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

| | |
|--|-----|
| Andrews v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 907 |
| Ayres v. Ayres (Orders) | 903 |
| Birch v. Commissioner of Correction | 37 |
| <i>Habeas corpus; claim that state deprived petitioner of due process right to fair trial insofar as it failed to correct trial testimony of former director of state police forensic laboratory that red substance on towel found in victim's home after murder of which petitioner was convicted tested positive for blood when no such test had been conducted and when subsequent testing performed years after petitioner's criminal trial revealed that red substance was not in fact blood; certification to appeal; whether habeas court applied correct standard in determining whether petitioner was entitled to new trial; standard to be applied whenever state fails to correct testimony that it knows or should have known to be false; whether former director of state police forensic laboratory should have known that his testimony was incorrect; whether such testimony is imputed to prosecutor; claim that respondent, Commissioner of Correction, failed to establish beyond reasonable doubt that incorrect testimony was immaterial; strength of state's case against petitioner, discussed.</i> | |
| Birch v. State | 69 |
| <i>Felony murder; petition for new trial based on claim of newly discovered DNA and other evidence; claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that newly discovered DNA evidence did not warrant new trial; whether this court's decision in Birch v. Commissioner of Correction (334 Conn. 37), which addressed petitioner's appeal from denial of habeas petition and in which court determined that petitioner was entitled to new trial, rendered present appeal moot.</i> | |
| Burke v. Mesniaeff | 100 |
| <i>Civil action alleging assault and battery; criminal trespass; certification from Appellate Court; claim that trial court improperly instructed jury with respect to special defense of justification by incorporating charge on criminal trespass; whether jury was misled by trial court's improper instruction on criminal trespass and defense of premises in arriving at its finding on defendant's justification defense; whether trial court's improper instruction affected jury's independent finding with respect to defendant's special defense of defense of others; whether evidence was sufficient to support jury's finding that defendant was acting in defense of others when he forcibly removed plaintiff from house.</i> | |
| Goldstein v. Hu (Order) | 907 |
| Henning v. Commissioner of Correction | 1 |
| <i>Habeas corpus; claim that state deprived petitioner of due process right to fair trial insofar as it failed to correct trial testimony of former director of state police forensic laboratory that red substance on towel found in victim's home after murder of which petitioner was convicted tested positive for blood when no such test had been conducted and when subsequent testing performed years after petitioner's criminal trial revealed that red substance was not in fact blood; certification to appeal; whether habeas court applied correct standard in determining whether petitioner was entitled to new trial; standard to be applied whenever state fails to correct testimony that it knows or should have known to be false; whether former director of state police forensic laboratory should have known that his testimony was incorrect; whether such testimony is imputed to prosecutor; claim that respondent, Commissioner of Correction, failed to establish beyond reasonable doubt that incorrect testimony was immaterial; strength of state's case against petitioner, discussed.</i> | |
| Henning v. State | 33 |
| <i>Felony murder; petition for new trial based on claim of newly discovered DNA and other evidence; claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that newly discovered DNA evidence did not warrant new trial; whether this court's decision</i> | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| <i>in Henning v. Commissioner of Correction (334 Conn. 1), which addressed petitioner's appeal from denial of habeas petition and in which court determined that petitioner was entitled to new trial, rendered present appeal moot.</i> | |
| JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Shack (Order) | 908 |
| Klein v. Quinnipiac University (Order) | 903 |
| Lazar v. Ganim. | 73 |
| <i>Elections; primaries; action brought by electors pursuant to statute (§ 9-329a) to challenge, inter alia, improprieties in handling of absentee ballots during primary election and seeking order directing new primary election; expedited appeal pursuant to statute (§ 9-325); whether appeal challenging results of primary and seeking new primary election was moot when general election has already occurred; whether trial court correctly determined that plaintiffs lacked standing to bring claims pursuant to § 9-329a (a) (1); whether trial court applied proper standard in determining whether plaintiff was entitled to new primary election.</i> | |
| Ledyard v. WMS Gaming, Inc. (Order) | 904 |
| Nationstar Mortgage, LLC v. Gabriel (Orders) | 907, 908 |
| Peek v. Manchester Memorial Hospital (Order) | 906 |
| Reale v. Rhode Island (Order) | 901 |
| Saunders v. Briner. | 135 |
| <i>Limited liability companies; standing; subject matter jurisdiction; whether, in absence of authorization in limited liability company's operating agreement, members or managers lack standing to bring derivative claims in action brought under Connecticut Limited Liability Company Act ([Rev. to 2017] § 34-100 et seq.) or under common law; whether trial court may exempt single-member limited liability company from direct and separate injury requirement necessary to bring direct action; policy considerations applicable in determining whether to treat action raising derivative claims as direct action, discussed; under what circumstances, if any, trial court may apportion award of attorney's fees under Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); claim that trial court abused its discretion in declining to order defendants to reimburse limited liability company for fees incurred by joint, court-appointed fiduciary retained to wind up limited liability companies.</i> | |
| Seminole Realty, LLC v. Sekretsev (Order) | 905 |
| State v. Alexis (Order) | 904 |
| State v. Bryan (Order) | 906 |
| State v. Cane (Order) | 901 |
| State v. Crewe (Order) | 901 |
| State v. Gomes (Order) | 902 |
| State v. Sentementes (Order) | 902 |
| Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Caldrello (Order) | 905 |
| Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Magana (Order) | 904 |
| Wiederman v. Halpert | 199 |
| <i>Limited liability companies; breach of fiduciary duty; motion to open; claim that trial court improperly exercised subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims because her alleged injuries were derivative of harm suffered by limited liability companies of which she and certain defendants were members; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly upheld determination of trial court that plaintiff had standing to sue; certification improvidently granted.</i> | |
| Wozniak v. Colchester (Order) | 906 |