

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 336

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

A & R Enterprises, LLC v. Sentinel Ins. Co., Ltd. (Order)	921
Bank of America, National Assn. v. Sorrentino (Order)	922
Bank of New York Mellon v. Mercier (Order)	913
Bank of New York Mellon v. Ruttkamp (Order)	902
Borelli v. Renaldi	3
<i>Negligence; high speed police pursuit; summary judgment; governmental immunity; whether trial court correctly concluded that statute (§ 14-283 (d)) governing operation of emergency vehicles, as well as defendant town's police pursuit policy, imposes discretionary, rather than ministerial, duty on police officers to drive with due regard for safety of all persons and property; whether defendants were immune from liability in connection with pursuit of fleeing motorist; whether plaintiff failed to demonstrate that identifiable person-imminent harm exception to discretionary act immunity applied in present case.</i>	
Brown v. State (Order)	904
Budrawich v. Budrawich (Order)	909
Cole v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	908
Coleman v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	922
Corley v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	913
CT Freedom Alliance, LLC v. Dept. of Education (Order)	914
Davis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	916
Doe v. Flanigan (Order)	901
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Chemtura Corp.	194
<i>Breach of contract; whether trial court properly rendered judgment for defendant on claim alleging breach of commercial contract governed by New York law when plaintiff failed to strictly comply with notice provision; whether New York law requires strict compliance with notice provision of commercial contract when other party to contract receives actual notice and is not prejudiced by lack of strict compliance.</i>	
Gomez v. Commissioner of Correction	170
<i>Habeas corpus; certification from Appellate Court; claim that habeas counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to raise claim of due process violation in petitioner's earlier habeas case; whether petitioner's due process rights were violated under Napue v. Illinois (360 U.S. 264) and Giglio v. United States (405 U.S.150) when prosecutor knowingly failed to correct false testimony of state's key witnesses at petitioner's criminal trial regarding their cooperation agreements with state, even though defense counsel had actual or constructive knowledge of those agreements; whether disclosure to defense counsel that witness has given false testimony, by itself, necessarily cures any violation of criminal defendant's due process rights under Napue and Giglio.</i>	
Gould v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	921
Hamm v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	913
Haydusky's Appeal from Probate (Order)	915
Henderson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	916
Heyward v. Leftridge (Orders)	902, 903
Ingram v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	916
In re D'Andre T. (Order)	902
In re Ja'La L. (Order)	909
In re Ja'Maire M. (Order)	911
In re Josiah D. (Order)	915
In re Zakai F.	272
<i>Petition for reinstatement of guardianship rights pursuant to statute (§ 45a-611); certification from Appellate Court; whether parent seeking reinstatement of guardianship rights is entitled to rebuttable, constitutional presumption that reinstatement is in best interests of child once parent has established that cause for removal no longer exists; whether third party seeking to rebut presumption</i>	

that reinstatement of guardianship is in child's best interests must do so by clear and convincing evidence; weighing of factors set forth in Mathews v. Eldridge (424 U.S. 319) for purpose of determining proper standard of proof in reinstatement of guardianship proceedings.

Kaminski v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	915
Kelsey v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	912
Kondjoua v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	907
Leonova v. Leonov (Order)	906
Nash v. Roland Dumont Agency, Inc. (Order)	917
Nationstar Mortgage, LLC v. Zanett (Order)	919
Osborn v. Waterbury (Order)	903
Pearson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	914
Pierce v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	914
Roberts v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	920
Rose v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	920
St. Louis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	919
Schuler v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	905
Speer v. Skaats (Order)	910
Stanley v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	901
Stanley v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	912
State v. Edwards (Order)	920
State v. Freeman (Order)	907
State v. Hazard (Order)	901
State v. Joseph A.	247
<i>Assault of disabled person third degree; disorderly conduct; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had not abused its discretion in determining that defendant's waiver of right to counsel during pretrial stage of proceedings was knowing, intelligent and voluntary; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that defendant understood nature of charges against him; claim that defendant's waiver of right to counsel was constitutionally inadequate because trial court did not make him aware of dangers and disadvantages of self-representation during canvass; claim that trial court's failure to canvass defendant regarding right to counsel during arraignment and plea negotiations was structural error; whether alleged error concerning failure to canvass defendant regarding right to counsel during arraignment and plea negotiations was harmless.</i>	
State v. Knox (Orders)	905, 906
State v. Lemanski (Order)	907
State v. Mansfield (Order)	910
State v. Qayyum (Order)	911
State v. Ruiz-Pacheco	219
<i>Assault first degree as principal; assault first degree as accessory; double jeopardy; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that defendant's convictions of assault in first degree as principal and assault in first degree as accessory as to each victim did not violate double jeopardy clause of United States constitution; proper inquiry, for double jeopardy purposes, when defendant is convicted of multiple violations of same substantive criminal statute, discussed; whether legislature intended to punish individual acts separately or to punish course of action that they constitute under first degree assault statute (§ 53a-59 (a) (1)) under which defendant was convicted; whether defendant's assaultive acts against victims were part of same continuing course of conduct.</i>	
State v. Schimanski (Order)	903
State v. Sebben (Order)	919
State v. Williams (Order)	917
Tunick v. Tunick (Order)	910
Vaccaro v. Loscalzo (Order)	908
Vogue v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act (Order)	918
Wahba v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. (Order)	909
Wittman v. Intense Movers, Inc. (Order)	918
Wright v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	905
Young v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	904