

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 337

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

| | |
|--|----------|
| Asnat Realty, LLC v. United Illuminating Co. (Order) | 906 |
| Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC v. Macrae-Gray (Order) | 905 |
| Berka v. Middletown (Order) | 910 |
| Blondeau v. Baltierra | 127 |
| <i>Dissolution of marriage; arbitration; whether final judgment existed for purposes of appellate jurisdiction when arbitration award included issues related to child support in violation of statutory provision (§ 46b-66 (c)) governing agreements to arbitrate in dissolution proceedings; claim that motion to vacate arbitration award was untimely pursuant to statute (§ 52-420 (b)), and that trial court therefore lacked jurisdiction, because it failed to set forth factual basis for vacating award within limitation period specified in § 52-420 (b); claim that trial court lacked jurisdiction to consider arguments in motion to vacate pertaining to child support because plaintiff was not aggrieved by that portion of award and because issue of child support had been rendered moot by parties' pendente lite stipulations; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that arbitrator's award exceeded scope of parties' submission; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that arbitrator manifestly disregarded law by ignoring choice of law provision in premarital agreement and distributing equity in marital home in accordance with Connecticut law; whether party to dissolution matter can waive statutory (§§ 46b-66 (c) and 52-408) prohibition against arbitration of issues related to child support; whether portion of arbitration award ordering payment of certain expenses related to children was severable from remainder of award.</i> | |
| Boccanfuso v. Daghoghi | 228 |
| <i>Summary process; doctrine of equitable nonforfeiture; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly affirmed judgment of possession in favor of plaintiff landlords; claim that trial court abused its discretion by rejecting defendant tenants' special defense of equitable nonforfeiture; whether defendants' intentional nonpayment of rent was necessarily wilful for purposes of equitable nonforfeiture doctrine, when rent was not withheld because of good faith intent to comply with lease or good faith dispute over terms of lease.</i> | |
| Britton v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 901 |
| Caires v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. (Orders) | 901, 904 |
| Cole v. New Haven | 326 |
| <i>Negligence; governmental immunity; summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motion for summary judgment on ground that defendant city and its police officer were entitled to governmental immunity; whether trial court correctly concluded that city's police pursuit policy and state-wide police pursuit policy impose discretionary, rather than ministerial, duty on police officers not to execute roadblock while pursuing dirt bikes or all-terrain vehicles on public road.</i> | |
| Conroy v. Idlibi (Order) | 905 |
| Cookish v. Commissioner of Correction | 348 |
| <i>Habeas corpus; appeal from habeas court's denial of certification to appeal; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to rules of practice (§ 23-29) without first appointing petitioner counsel and providing him with notice and opportunity to be heard; whether habeas court can dismiss petition pursuant to § 23-29 before issuing writ of habeas corpus under rules of practice (§ 23-24); claim that habeas court's judgment should be reversed on basis of plain error; claim that habeas court improperly failed to construe petitioner's habeas petition as petition for writ of error coram nobis.</i> | |
| Donald G. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 907 |
| Dougan v. Sikorsky Aircraft Corp. | 27 |
| <i>Negligence; workplace asbestos exposure; summary judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motion for summary judgment on ground that claim for medical monitoring in absence of manifestation of physical injury was</i> | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>not cognizable under Connecticut law; medical monitoring, discussed; whether plaintiffs had established genuine issue of material fact as to whether medical monitoring was reasonably necessary for each individual plaintiff.</i> | |
| Gershon v. Back (Order) | 901 |
| Harvey v. Dept. of Correction | 291 |
| <i>Wrongful death; sovereign immunity; statute of limitations; motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether action was time barred pursuant to statute (§ 4-160 (d)) that requires plaintiff who has been granted authorization to sue state by Claims Commissioner to bring action within one year from date that authorization was granted; claim that action was not untimely because one year time limitation in § 4-160 (d) was inoperative and two year time limitation in wrongful death statute (§ 52-555 (a)) controlled plaintiff's wrongful death claim.</i> | |
| In re Angela V. (Order) | 907 |
| In re Jacob M. (Order) | 909 |
| In re Kiara Liz V. (Order) | 904 |
| In re Natasha T. (Order) | 909 |
| Lance W. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 902 |
| Nash v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 908 |
| Nash Street, LLC v. Main Street America Assurance Co. | 1 |
| <i>Action seeking to recover proceeds allegedly due under commercial general liability insurance policy issued by defendant insurer; summary judgment; whether defendant had duty to defend in action brought by plaintiff against insured and alleging property damage resulting from collapse of house that had been lifted off foundation; whether trial court improperly granted defendant's motion for summary judgment; whether there existed possibility that plaintiff's complaint in action against insured alleged liability for property damage that was not excluded under insurance policy; whether trial court incorrectly determined that certain exclusions in insurance policy relieved defendant of its duty to defend.</i> | |
| Ortiz v. Torres-Rodriguez (Order) | 910 |
| Property Tax Management, LLC v. Worldwide Properties, LLC (Order) | 903 |
| Redding v. Georgetown Land Development Co., LLC. | 75 |
| <i>Strict foreclosure; summary judgment; whether trial court correctly concluded that, under 2007 public act (P.A. 07-196, § 4 (b) (3)), liens that defendant company had acquired from special taxing district were subordinate to those of plaintiff town and fire district.</i> | |
| Rice v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 906 |
| Robinson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | 903 |
| Rodriguez v. Kaiaffa, LLC. | 248 |
| <i>Class action; motion for class certification; interlocutory appeal pursuant to statute (§ 52-265a) involving matter of substantial public interest; standards that govern trial court's class certification decision, discussed; whether trial court should have inquired into merits of plaintiff's legal theory in determining whether prerequisites to class action set forth in applicable rules of practice (§§ 9-7 and 9-8) were satisfied; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that commonality, typicality, and adequacy of representation requirements for class certification had been satisfied; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that common issues of law and fact predominated and that class action was superior to other methods of adjudication; claim that trial court improperly defined class.</i> | |
| Solon v. Slater (Order) | 908 |
| State v. Best | 312 |
| <i>Murder; attempt to commit murder; assault first degree; claim that trial court abused its discretion in admitting into evidence certain photographs depicting bloody interior of car used by victims to flee shooting; whether photographs were relevant to crimes with which defendant was charged; whether probative value of photographs outweighed their prejudicial effect.</i> | |
| State v. Cicarella (Order) | 902 |
| State v. Chester J. (Order) | 910 |
| State v. Cody M. | 92 |
| <i>Violation of standing criminal protective order; threatening second degree; double jeopardy; certification from Appellate Court; claim that defendant's conviction of two counts of violating standing criminal protective order violated constitutional prohibition against double jeopardy; whether legislature intended to punish individual acts separately or to punish course of action that they constitute under</i> | |

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| | <i>violation of standing criminal protective order statute (§ 53a-223a); whether Appellate Court improperly upheld trial court's jury instruction on charge of criminal violation of standing criminal protective order.</i> | |
| State v. Coleman (Order) | | 907 |
| State v. Foster (Order) | | 904 |
| State v. Luciano (Order) | | 903 |
| State v. Marsala | | 55 |
| | <i>Criminal trespass first degree; defendant's request that jury be instructed on infraction of simple trespass as lesser included offense; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court properly declined to instruct jury on simple trespass as lesser included offense; whether prerequisites set forth in State v. Whistnant (179 Conn. 576) for obtaining jury instruction on lesser included offense were satisfied.</i> | |
| State v. Rodriguez | | 175 |
| | <i>Sexual assault first degree; criminal attempt to commit sexual assault first degree; unpreserved claim that trial court violated defendant's right to confrontation by allowing forensic science examiner to testify about results of DNA identification analysis without requiring testimony from individual who generated DNA profiles; unpreserved claim that defendant's due process right was violated by introduction of DNA identification evidence that was unreliable; claim that evidence of random match probability of 1 in 230,000 in Hispanic population, by itself, was insufficient to establish that defendant was guilty of crimes charged beyond reasonable doubt.</i> | |
| Turner v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) | | 909 |
| Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Robertson (Order) | | 905 |