

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 |
| Cohen v. King (Order) | 925 |
| Cole v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 908 |
| Coleman v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 922 |
| Collins v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 931 |
| Commissioner of Public Health v. Colandrea (Order) | 930 |
| Cordero v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 926 |
| Corley v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 913 |
| CT Freedom Alliance, LLC v. Dept. of Education (Order) | 914 |
| Davis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 916 |
| DeLeo v. Equale & Cirone, LLP (Order) | 927 |
| Doe v. Flanigan (Order) | 901 |
| Dovenmuehle Mortgage, Inc. v. Janniello (Order) | 922 |
| Dwyer v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 931 |
| 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> | |
| Fay v. Merrill. | 432 |
| <i>Congressional elections; action brought pursuant to statute (§ 9-323) allowing any elector or candidate who claims that he is aggrieved by any ruling of any election official in connection with election for, among other public offices, representative in Congress, to file complaint with justice of Supreme Court; motion to dismiss; claim that application for absentee ballot adding COVID-19 as reason for absentee voting was unconstitutional and based on erroneous interpretation of governor's executive order; whether this court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's action under § 9-323.</i> | |
| Featherston v. Katchko & Son Construction Services, Inc. (Order) | 923 |
| Felder v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 924 |
| Figuroa v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 926 |
| Godfrey v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 931 |
| 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 agree-</i> | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| <i>ments 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 |
| 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 Kameron N. (Orders) | 926, 927 |
| In re Marcquan C. (Order) | 924 |
| In re Phoenix A. (Order) | 932 |
| 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 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.</i> | |
| Ingram v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 916 |
| International Investors v. Town Plan & Zoning Commission (Order) | 928 |
| Kaminski v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 915 |
| Kelsey v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 912 |
| Kondjoua v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 907 |
| Lafferty v. Jones | 332 |
| <i>Invasion of privacy; special motions to dismiss under anti-SLAPP statute (§ 52-5196a); interlocutory appeal pursuant to statute (§ 52-265a) involving matter of substantial public interest; first amendment; sanctions; whether trial court violated defendants' first amendment rights by imposing sanctions for named defendant's extrajudicial speech harassing and threatening plaintiffs' counsel; whether trial court abused its discretion in imposing sanctions for discovery order violations and named defendant's extrajudicial speech; whether trial court violated defendants' due process rights by failing to afford them sufficient notice and meaningful opportunity to be heard before imposing sanctions.</i> | |
| Leonova v. Leonov (Order) | 906 |
| Morales v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 930 |
| Nash v. Roland Dumont Agency, Inc. (Order) | 917 |
| Nationstar Mortgage, LLC v. Zanett (Order) | 919 |
| Osborn v. Waterbury (Order) | 903 |
| Palmer v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 924 |
| Pearson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 914 |
| Pierce v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 914 |
| Praisner v. State | 420 |
| <i>Indemnification pursuant to statute ((Rev. to 2013) § 53-39a); whether Appellate Court correctly determined that state university's special police force was not local police department for purposes of § 53-39a; whether 2017 amendment to § 53-39a was clarifying legislation applicable to plaintiff.</i> | |
| Pryor v. Brignole (Order) | 933 |
| Reliable Mechanical Contractors, LLC v. Ricketts (Order) | 932 |
| Rispoli v. East Haven (Order) | 927 |
| 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 |
| Seramonte Associates, LLC v. Hamden (Order) | 923 |
| Shoreline Shellfish, LLC v. Branford | 403 |
| <i>Breach of contract; right of first refusal to lease shellfishing grounds in defendant town; whether trial court improperly granted town's motion for summary judg-</i> | |

ment; whether genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether shellfishing ground plaintiffs sought to lease was owned by town within meaning of applicable provision (§ 88-8) of town code; whether town's Shellfish Commission had authority to lease shellfishing ground to plaintiffs under § 88-8 of town code.

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. Ferrazzano-Mazza (Order) 928

State v. Freeman (Order) 907

State v. Hazard (Order) 901

State v. Joseph A. 247

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.

State v. Knox (Orders) 905, 906

State v. Lemanski (Order) 907

State v. Mansfield (Order) 910

State v. Qayyum (Order) 911

State v. Ramon A. G. 386

Assault third degree; claim that trial court improperly declined to instruct jury on defense of personal property with respect to assault charge; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that defendant failed to preserve his claim of instructional error; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that defendant waived his unreserved claim of instructional error.

State v. Ruiz-Pacheco 219

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.

State v. Russaw (Order) 933

State v. Sayles (Order) 929

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