

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>	
Boutillier v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	935
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
Figueroa v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	926
Godbout v. Freedom of Information Commission (Order)	936
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</i>	

<i>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
In re Ava W.	545
<i>Termination of parental rights; request for posttermination visitation; whether respondent mother was aggrieved by trial court's order declining to order posttermination visitation with her child; claim that issue of posttermination visitation was rendered moot by virtue of trial court's termination of respondent's parental rights; claim that respondent lacked standing to appeal from trial court's order because she did not appeal from or seek or obtain stay of termination judgment; whether trial court correctly concluded that it lacked authority to order posttermination visitation; whether trial court correctly relied on applicable statute (§ 17-112a (b) through (h)) to deny request for posttermination visitation; claim that trial court's denial of posttermination visitation should be upheld on alternative ground that court correctly determined that such visitation would not be in child's best interest; remand for dispositional hearing at which trial court is to consider merits of ordering visitation.</i>	
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 Probate Appeal of Concannon (Order)	937
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
Jan G. v. Semple (Order)	937
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
Northeast Builders Supply & Home Centers, LLC v. RMM Consulting, LLC (Order)	933
OneWest Bank, N.A. v. Ceslik (Order)	936

Osborn v. Waterbury (Order) 903

Osbourne v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) 937

Palmer v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) 924

Pascola-Milton v. Millard (Order) 934

Pearson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) 914

Pierce v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) 914

Praisner v. State 420

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.

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

Breach of contract; right of first refusal to lease shellfishing grounds in defendant town; whether trial court improperly granted town's motion for summary judgment; 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.

Solek v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) 935

Speer v. Skaats (Order) 910

Stanley v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) 901

Stanley v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) 912

State v. Ashby 452

Capital felony; murder; felony murder; sexual assault first degree; kidnapping first degree; burglary first degree; sixth amendment right to counsel; claim that state violated defendant's sixth amendment right to counsel by engaging jailhouse informant to deliberately elicit incriminating statements from defendant; whether informant acted as agent of state in eliciting incriminating statements from defendant; claim that there was insufficient evidence to establish that defendant remained unlawfully in victim's apartment for purpose of his conviction of first degree burglary; defendant's invitation to overrule State v. Allen (216 Conn. 367); stare decisis; whether trial court abused its discretion in declining to give third-party culpability instruction to jury in light of existence of unidentified person's DNA in and on victim's body and on doorframe of victim's bedroom.

State v. Edwards (Order) 920

State v. Ferrazzano-Mazza (Order) 928

State v. Freeman (Order) 907

State v. Hall-George (Order) 934

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
<i>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.</i>	
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. Russaw (Order)	933
State v. Sayles (Order)	929
State v. Schimanski (Order)	903
State v. Sebben (Order)	919
State v. Williams (Order)	917
Trust v. Bliss (Order)	938
Tunick v. Tunick (Order)	910
U.S. Bank, National Assn. v. Moncho (Order)	934
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