

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 335

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Bagaloo v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	905
Bank of America, N.A. v. Balgobin (Order)	903
Bank of New York Mellon v. Orlando (Order)	917
Bank of New York Mellon v. Ruttkamp (Order)	919
Benitez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	924
Berka v. Middletown (Order)	906
Boria v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	901
Brown v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	920
Chief Disciplinary Counsel v. Burbank (Order)	906
Christiana Trust v. Bliss (Order)	916
Cinotti v. Shred It U.S.A., LLC (Order)	930
Cooke v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	911
Dept. of Social Services v. Freeman (Order)	922
Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction	53
<i>Habeas corpus; claim of ineffective assistance of counsel; certification to appeal from habeas court's judgment; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court improperly raised and decided unpreserved issue of waiver without first providing parties opportunity to be heard on that issue, in contravention of this court's decision in Blumberg Associates Worldwide, Inc. v. Brown & Brown of Connecticut, Inc. (311 Conn. 123); proper scope of order of remand to Appellate Court, discussed.</i>	
Dombrowski v. New Haven (Order)	908
Edward Kowalsky Revocable Trust v. B & D Properties, LLC (Order)	914
Ervin v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	905
Factor King, LLC v. Housing Authority (Order)	927
Federal National Mortgage Assn. v. Trojan (Order)	910
Garcia v. Cohen	3
<i>Premises liability; negligence; contributory negligence; general verdict rule; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that general verdict rule precluded it from reviewing plaintiff's claim of instructional error; whether proposed interrogatories were properly framed; nondelegable duty doctrine, discussed; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that plaintiff's instructional error claim was not reviewable on ground that plaintiff had failed to raise independent claim of error on appeal with respect to trial court's decision not to submit her proposed interrogatories to jury.</i>	
Goguen v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	925
Hassiem v. O & G Industries, Inc. (Order)	928
Haywood v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	914
Holliday v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	901
In re Brian P. (Order)	907
In re Corey C. (Order)	930
In re Omar I. (Order)	924
Jason B. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	903
Jemiola v. Hartford Casualty Ins. Co.	117
<i>Homeowners insurance; breach of contract; denial of coverage by defendant insurance company for cracks in basement walls under provision in policy insuring against collapse of building or part thereof; summary judgment; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that only homeowners insurance policies issued to plaintiff by defendant since March, 2005, were applicable to plaintiff's claim for coverage; whether there was genuine issue of material fact as to whether structural integrity of plaintiff's basement walls was substantially impaired when policies issued to plaintiff before March, 2005, were in effect; whether trial court correctly concluded that collapse provision of applicable homeowners insurance policy unambiguously excluded coverage for cracks in plaintiff's basement walls; whether plaintiff's house suffered abrupt falling down or caving in, complete or</i>	

<i>partial, such that it could not be occupied for its intended purpose; claim that definition of “collapse” contained in policy was ambiguous and, therefore, that substantial impairment of structural integrity standard adopted by this court in Beach v. Middlesex Mutual Assurance Co. (205 Conn. 246) applied for purpose of determining coverage.</i>	
Jepsen v. Camassar (Order)	926
Johnson v. Preleski	138
<i>Petition for new trial based on newly discovered evidence; certification from Appellate Court; claim that petition was time barred because it was served on respondent state’s attorney one day after expiration of applicable limitation period; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that savings statute (§ 52-593a (a)), which requires that process be personally delivered to marshal within applicable limitation period, did not save untimely petition when process was sent by facsimile to marshal on final day of limitation period but there was no evidence as to when marshal came into physical possession of process; whether process is personally delivered to marshal within meaning of § 52-593a (a) when sender transmits it by facsimile; whether there was sufficient evidence to establish that process was personally delivered to marshal within applicable limitation period.</i>	
Jordan v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	931
Karas v. Liberty Ins. Corp.	62
<i>Homeowners insurance; breach of contract; crumbling foundations; motion for summary judgment; certified question from United States District Court for District of Connecticut; reformulation of certified question; whether substantial impairment of structural integrity standard, as set forth in Beach v. Middlesex Mutual Assurance Co. (205 Conn. 246), was applicable to provision of plaintiffs’ homeowners insurance policy covering collapse of building; evidence required to satisfy substantial impairment of structural integrity standard, discussed; claim that, to satisfy substantial impairment of structural integrity standard, home must be in imminent danger of falling down or caving in, that is, in imminent danger of actual collapse; whether coverage exclusion in plaintiffs’ homeowners insurance policy for collapse of “foundation” unambiguously included basement walls of plaintiffs’ home.</i>	
Kirby v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	930
Kohl’s Dept. Stores, Inc. v. Rocky Hill (Order)	917
Langston v. Commissioner of Correction.	1
<i>Habeas corpus; certification from Appellate Court; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed habeas petition as untimely filed; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that petitioner lacked good cause for his untimely filing when he had relied on advice of his attorney to withdraw previous, validly filed petition and to file present petition in its place, even though it would be subject to statutory (§ 52-470 (d)) presumption of delay; certification improvidently granted.</i>	
Lenti v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	905
Lopez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order).	904
Morton v. Syriac (Order)	915
Nationstar Mortgage, LLC v. Washington (Orders)	909
Nietupski v. Del Castillo (Order)	916
Nonhuman Rights Project, Inc. v. R.W. Commerford & Sons, Inc. (Order)	929
Pentland v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	919
Peterson v. Torrington (Order)	921
Petrucelli v. Meriden (Order)	923
Pfister v. Madison Beach Hotel, LLC (Order)	923
Platt v. Tilcon Connecticut, Inc. (Order)	917
Reserve Realty, LLC v. BLT Reserve, LLC (see Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC)	174
Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC	174
<i>Breach of contract; anticipatory breach; antitrust; claim that plaintiffs could not recover brokerage fees under certain real estate listing agreements because those agreements were list-back agreements that, defendants claimed, constituted per se illegal tying arrangements in violation of federal Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 1); certification from Appellate Court; claim that this court should overrule State v. Hossan-Maxwell, Inc. (181 Conn. 655), which held that list-back agreements committing purchaser of real property to use services of particular broker when leasing or reselling property are per se illegal, as no longer consistent with federal antitrust law; Hossan-Maxwell, Inc., to extent it held that real estate list-back</i>	

<i>agreements affecting not insubstantial volume of commerce are per se illegal, overruled; newly clarified standard governing antitrust challenges to list-back agreements, discussed.</i>	
Rojas v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	925
Ruiz v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	915
Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Speer (Order)	903
Sherman v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	929
Starboard Resources, Inc. v. Henry (Order)	919
State v. Albert D. (Order)	913
State v. Bermudez (Order)	908
State v. Bradbury (Order)	925
State v. Brown (Order)	902
State v. Bunn (Order)	918
State v. Corprew (Order)	918
State v. Covington	212
<i>Carrying pistol or revolver without permit; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that there was sufficient evidence to support defendant's conviction of carrying pistol or revolver without permit; whether state presented sufficient, circumstantial evidence to permit jury reasonably to conclude beyond reasonable doubt that firearm defendant was carrying had barrel less than twelve inches in length.</i>	
State v. Douglas C. (Order)	904
State v. Earley (Order)	902
State v. Fortin (Order)	926
State v. Francis (Order)	912
State v. Holley (Order)	922
State v. Lynch (Order)	914
State v. Milner (Order)	928
State v. Mitchell (Order)	912
State v. Nusser (Order)	918
State v. Petersen (Order)	921
State v. Randy G. (Order)	911
State v. Richards (Order)	931
State v. Rosa (Order)	920
State v. Sawyer	29
<i>Possession of child pornography second degree; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that search warrant affidavit provided probable cause to search defendant's residence for evidence of possession of child pornography; unreserved claim that this court should adopt more demanding standard under Connecticut constitution for assessing whether there is probable cause to issue search warrant.</i>	
State v. Taupier (Order)	928
State v. Tinsley (Order)	927
State v. Torres (Order)	913
State v. Tyus (Order)	907
State v. Villar (Order)	916
State v. Watson (Order)	912
State v. White (Order)	906
Streifel v. Bulkeley (Order)	911
Thomas v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	929
Thompson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	913
Turek v. Zoning Board of Appeals (Order)	915
U.S. Bank, National Assn. v. Mamudi (Order)	921
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Rothermel (Order)	910
U.S. Bank Trust, N.A. v. O'Brien (Order)	922
Vera v. Liberty Mutual Fire Ins. Co.	110
<i>Homeowners insurance; breach of contract; motion for summary judgment; removal of action from state court to federal court; certified question from United States District Court for District of Connecticut; reliance on this court's decision in companion case of Karas v. Liberty Ins. Corp. (335 Conn. 62); whether, to satisfy substantial impairment of structural integrity standard, as set forth in Beach v. Middlesex Mutual Assurance Co. (205 Conn. 246), home must be in imminent danger of falling down or caving in, that is, in imminent danger of actual collapse.</i>	
Williams v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	923