

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 335

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

American Tax Funding, LLC v. First Eagle Corp. (Order)	942
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
Bank of New York Mellon v. Ruttkamp (Order)	951
Benitez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	924
Berger v. Deutermann (Order)	956
Berka v. Middletown (Order)	906
Boria v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	901
Brown v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	920
Carabetta Organization, Ltd. v. Meriden (Order)	940
Castro v. Bajana (Order)	958
Chelsea Groton Bank v. Belltown Sports, LLC (Order)	960
Cheswold (TL), LLC, BMO Harris Bank, N.A. v. Kwong (Order)	941
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
Daley v. Kashmanian (Orders)	939,940
Davis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	948
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
Farrell v. Johnson & Johnson	398
<i>Informed consent; innocent misrepresentation; directed verdict; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court did not abuse its discretion in declining to admit into evidence two medical journal articles on ground that they constituted inadmissible hearsay; claim that articles were admissible to prove what defendant physician knew or reasonably should have known with respect to experimental nature of procedure used to implant medical product in plaintiff patient and product itself; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's decision to direct verdict on plaintiffs' innocent misrepresentation claim; whether innocent misrepresentation claim was viable in context of provision of medical services.</i>	
Federal National Mortgage Assn. v. Trojan (Order)	910
500 North Avenue, LLC v. Planning Commission (Order)	959
Flood v. Flood (Order)	960
Fry v. Lobbuzzo (Order)	951
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</i>	

	<i>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>	
Gawlik v. Semple (Order)		953
Goguen v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)		925
Hall v. Hall		377
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion for contempt; motion for reconsideration; joint motion to open and vacate contempt finding; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court did not abuse its discretion in finding plaintiff in contempt on basis of his wilful violation of court order; claim that trial court failed to consider plaintiff's testimony that, when he violated court order, he was relying in good faith on advice of counsel; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying parties' joint motion to open and vacate finding of contempt.</i>	
Hamann v. Carl (Orders)		949
Hassiem v. O & G Industries, Inc. (Order)		928
Haywood v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)		914
Holliday v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)		901
In re Aisjaha N. (Order)		943
In re Brian P. (Order)		907
In re Cataleya M. (Order) (See In re Gabriel C.)		938
In re Corey C. (Order)		930
In re Faiz Siddiqui (Order)		955
In re Gabriel C. (Order)		938
In re Isabella M. (Order) (See In re Gabriel C.)		938
In re Omar I. (Order)		924
In re Savannah F. (Order) (See In re Gabriel C.)		938
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 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
Kammili v. Kammili (Order)		947
Karagozian v. USV Optical, Inc.		426
	<i>Wrongful discharge; motion to strike; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's granting of defendant employer's motion to strike plaintiff employee's complaint; whether standard for constructive</i>	

discharge set forth in Brittell v. Dept. of Correction (247 Conn. 148) required plaintiff to demonstrate that defendant intended to force plaintiff to resign; whether Appellate Court correctly upheld trial court's granting of motion to strike on alternative ground that plaintiff had failed to allege facts establishing that work atmosphere was so difficult or unpleasant that reasonable person in his shoes would have felt compelled to resign.

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
Kovachich v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services (Order)	958
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
Maselli v. Regional School District Number 10 (Order)	947
Merrit Medical Center Owners Corp., Inc. v. Gianetti (Order)	950
Morton v. Syriac (Order)	915
Mosby v. Board of Education (Order)	939
MTGLQ Investors, L.P. v. Hammons (Order)	950
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
Olbrych v. Kaster Moving Co. (Order)	952
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
Priore v. Haig (Order).	955
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 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
Scholz v. Epstein (Order).	943
Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Speer (Order)	903

Semac Electric Co. v. Skanska USA Building, Inc. (Orders)	945
Schwerin v. Ratcliffe	300
<i>Action seeking judgment declaring proper distribution of assets from two family trusts; motions for summary judgment; per stirpes distribution of trusts; claim that stirpital roots should begin at level of grantor's grandchildren, resulting in trust principal being initially divided into six equal shares; claim that stirpital roots should be determined once trust terms expire and that roots should be at whatever level of descendants has members living at time of expiration; claim that trial court correctly determined that stirpital roots should be at level of grantor's children, resulting in trust principal being initially divided into three equal shares; claim that, because trusts provided for principal to be distributed to grantors' issue "then living," grantors could not have intended for initial division to be at level of three children.</i>	
Sherman v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	929
Spicer v. Montagnese (Order)	954
Stanley v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	946
Starboard Resources, Inc. v. Henry (Order)	919
State v. Albert D. (Order)	913
State v. Auburn W. (Order)	950
State v. Bermudez (Order)	908
State v. Bradbury (Order)	925
State v. Brown (Order)	902
State v. Brown (Order)	942
State v. Bunn (Order)	918
State v. Carpenter (Order)	940
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. Crafter (Order)	957
State v. Douglas C. (Order)	904
State v. Dyous (Order)	948
State v. Earley (Order)	902
State v. Fortin (Order)	926
State v. Francis (Order)	912
State v. Hargett (Order)	952
State v. Holley (Order)	922
State v. Ingala (Order)	954
State v. Jackson (Order)	957
State v. Joseph V. (Order)	945
State v. Kosuda-Bigazzi	327
<i>Murder; tampering with physical evidence; appeal pursuant to statute (§ 52-265a) involving matter of substantial public interest; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss charges; whether trial court committed clear error in determining that defendant failed to establish that certain documents seized by police pursuant to search warrant were protected by attorney-client privilege; whether trial court abused its discretion in limiting testimony of defendant's expert witnesses and in precluding testimony of two other expert witnesses; claim that manner in which documents were maintained established that they were privileged; claim that documents were sufficient in and of themselves to be considered privileged because their content was obviously useful to preparing defense; claim that documents in one seized file were privileged because they were substantively identical to documents in other seized file that parties had stipulated was covered by attorney-client privilege; claim that file containing estate planning documents was subject to attorney-client privilege because documents were created for purpose of seeking legal advice; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that dismissal of charges was not warranted and that state established by clear and convincing evidence that remedial steps it took could cure any presumed prejudice and prevent future prejudice to defendant.</i>	
State v. Lopez (Order)	951
State v. Lori T. (Order)	956

State v. Lynch (Order)	914
State v. Mayo (Order)	954
State v. Milner (Order)	928
State v. Mitchell (Order)	912
State v. Nusser (Order)	918
State v. Petersen (Order)	921
State v. Prince A. (Order)	949
State v. Randy G. (Order)	911
State v. Rhodes	226
<i>Criminal possession of firearm; having weapon in motor vehicle; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of criminal possession of firearm when evidence established only that defendant and firearm were in same car at same time; whether there was sufficient evidence from which jury reasonably could have found that defendant constructively possessed firearm; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of having weapon in motor vehicle; claim that “knowingly has” element of statute ((Rev. to 2013) § 29-38 (a)) prohibiting having weapon in motor vehicle should be construed to mean “knowingly possesses”; whether trial court committed plain error in applying law existing at time of defendant’s trial; defendant’s request that this court exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice.</i>	
State v. Richards (Order)	931
State v. Romero (Order)	955
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; unpreserved 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. Smith (Order)	932
State v. Taupier (Order)	928
State v. Taveras (Order)	948
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. Bulkley (Order)	911
Summit Saugatuck, LLC v. Water Pollution Control Authority (Order)	944
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. Madison (Order)	941
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>	
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Melahn (Order)	947
Williams v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	923
Williams v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles (Order)	952
Winakor v. Savalle (Order)	958
Woods v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	938