

**Cumulative Table of Cases**  
**Connecticut Reports**  
**Volume 339**

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

Acorn Developers, LLC v. Pinto (Order) . . . . .	909
Anthony A. v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	290
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court incorrectly determined that Department of Correction did not violate petitioner's constitutional right to procedural due process in classifying him as sex offender; whether petitioner was afforded all of procedural protections required by Wolff v. McDonnell (418 U.S. 539); whether there was sufficient evidence in record to support petitioner's classification as sex offender; claim that habeas court incorrectly concluded that department did not violate petitioner's state constitutional right to substantive due process by classifying him as sex offender; whether department's classification decision could withstand rational basis review; whether habeas court correctly concluded that petitioner's classification as sex offender on basis of nonconviction information did not violate article first, § 9, of Connecticut constitution.</i>	
Antonio A. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	909
Bank of New York Mellon v. Tope (Order) . . . . .	901
Banks v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	1
<i>Habeas corpus; kidnapping first degree; robbery first degree; whether habeas court should have assessed harm of error under State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509) in accordance with legal standard articulated in Brecht v. Abrahamson (507 U.S. 619) or that articulated in Neder v. United States (527 U.S. 1); whether habeas court correctly determined that trial court's failure to instruct jury in accordance with Salamon was harmless when petitioner, after having taken property from victims, forcibly removed them from scene of robbery and restrained them in order to facilitate his escape.</i>	
Bell v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	79
<i>Habeas corpus; robbery first degree; kidnapping first degree; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that absence of jury instruction in accordance with State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509) at petitioner's criminal trial was not harmless error.</i>	
Bellerive v. Grotto, Inc. (Order) . . . . .	908
Carrasquillo v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	907
Conklin v. Teachers Ins. Co. (Order) . . . . .	907
Devine v. Fusaro (Order) . . . . .	904
Fain v. Benak (Order) . . . . .	906
Farmington-Girard, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission . . . . .	268
<i>Zoning; administrative appeals; subject matter jurisdiction; exhaustion of administrative remedies; certification from Appellate Court; claim that trial court improperly dismissed administrative appeals for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether Appellate Court incorrectly determined that city's zoning administrator had authority to determine that plaintiff property owner's application for special permit was void; whether plaintiff's consolidated appeals were moot; whether Appellate Court incorrectly determined that plaintiff was required to appeal from decision of city's zoning administrator purporting to void plaintiff's application for special permit.</i>	
Fenner v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	908
Gibson v. Jefferson Woods Community, Inc. (Order) . . . . .	911
Gonzalez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	909
Great Plains Lending, LLC v. Dept. of Banking . . . . .	112
<i>Administrative appeal; tribal sovereign immunity; whether trial court properly sustained plaintiffs' appeal from decision of Commissioner of Banking ordering plaintiffs to cease and desist and to pay civil penalties for violating Connecticut's banking and usury laws; claim that plaintiff businesses, which were created pursuant to laws of federally recognized Indian tribe, were entitled to tribal sovereign immunity as arms of tribe; claim that plaintiff chairman of Indian tribe shared in tribal sovereign immunity of plaintiff businesses; whether trial court correctly determined that entities claiming tribal sovereign immunity bore</i>	

<i>burden of proving, by preponderance of evidence, their status as arms of tribe; claim that trial court applied improper test for determining whether entity is entitled to sovereign immunity as arm of tribe; whether tribal sovereign immunity extended to plaintiff chairman with respect to civil penalty imposed on him and with respect to prospective injunctive relief.</i>	
Harris v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	905
Hasan v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	910
Holloway v. Carvalho (Order) . . . . .	911
In re Karter F. (Order) . . . . .	912
LPP Mortgage Ltd. v. Underwood Towers Ltd. Partnership (Orders) . . . . .	905, 906
Markley v. State Elections Enforcement Commission . . . . .	96
<i>Administrative appeal; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiffs' appeal challenging defendant agency's action on petition for reconsideration of final decision for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; lawfulness of defendant's consideration of plaintiffs' petition for reconsideration after petition had been denied by operation of law (§ 4-181a (a) (1)) through inaction by defendant, discussed; defendant's consideration of petition for reconsideration pursuant to § 4-181a (a) (2), discussed; whether plaintiff's appeal was timely filed pursuant to statute (§ 4-183 (c) (3)).</i>	
Reserve Realty, LLC v. BLT Reserve, LLC (Order) . . . . .	902
Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC (Orders) . . . . .	901, 903
State v. Alicea . . . . .	385
<i>Assault first degree; claim that jury's verdict of guilty of intentional assault and reckless assault was legally inconsistent; claim that state could not maintain on appeal that defendant's convictions were consistent on ground that state's theory of case at trial contemplated charges of intentional and reckless assault as alternatives.</i>	
State v. Arnold (Order) . . . . .	904
State v. Courtney G. . . . .	328
<i>First degree sexual assault; risk of injury to child; prosecutorial impropriety; whether trial court improperly admitted evidence of victim's out-of-court demeanor; whether prosecutor engaged in improprieties during closing and rebuttal arguments; claim that prosecutor's comment that defendant displayed "lack of outrage" at sexual abuse allegations violated his right to confrontation and improperly appealed to jurors' emotions and passions; whether prosecutor's comment that defendant displayed "lack of outrage" referred to defendant's testimonial demeanor or his courtroom demeanor unrelated to his demeanor while testifying; claim that prosecutor improperly diluted presumption of innocence and infringed on defendant's right to testify by referring to his interest in outcome of case; claim that prosecutor improperly expressed her personal opinion with respect to defendant's credibility by questioning inconsistencies in his testimony; claim that prosecutor's comments regarding victim's lack of motive to lie and testimonial demeanor were improper expressions of personal opinion; claim that prosecutor provided improper statement of law when she described reasonable doubt standard; whether prosecutor improperly mischaracterized evidence and risked diluting state's burden of proof by informing jury that victim's testimony was unchallenged and uncontroverted; whether prosecutorial improprieties deprived defendant of due process right to fair trial.</i>	
State v. Felimon C. (Order) . . . . .	911
State v. Mark T. . . . .	225
<i>Risk of injury to child conviction in connection with incident in which defendant dragged his daughter down school hallway; defense of parental justification; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that trial court had not abused its discretion in precluding defendant, who represented himself at trial, from asking daughter's teacher, during cross-examination, whether she had ever seen daughter become physical with another person at school; whether trial court abused its discretion by limiting defendant's direct examination of himself, during which he sought to elicit his own testimony about information crucial to his parental justification defense; whether trial court's error was harmful.</i>	
State v. Marshall (Order) . . . . .	912
State v. Morlo M. (Order) . . . . .	910

State v. Williams (Order) . . . . .	910
State v. Weathers . . . . .	187
<i>Murder; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; carrying pistol without permit; affirmative defense of mental disease or defect; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had reasonably rejected defendant's defense of mental disease or defect and opinions of defendant's experts relating to that defense.</i>	
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Booker (Order) . . . . .	912
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Rothermel . . . . .	366
<i>Foreclosure; strict foreclosure; motion to open judgment; dismissal of appeal as moot; certification from Appellate Court; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that it was precluded by statute (§ 49-15) from opening judgment of strict foreclosure after law day had passed and title had become absolute in plaintiff bank; whether trial court had jurisdiction to open judgment of strict foreclosure when defendant raised equitable grounds involving alleged misrepresentations by plaintiff's loan servicer; whether Appellate Court properly dismissed defendant's appeal as moot in light of equitable nature of defendant's claims; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's motion to open judgment.</i>	
Wilton Campus 1691, LLC v. Wilton . . . . .	157
<i>Tax appeals; imposition of tax penalties pursuant to statute (§ 12-63c (d)) for plaintiffs' failure to timely submit certain annual income and expense reports required by assessor of defendant town; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that assessor improperly imposed late filing penalties on plaintiffs pursuant to § 12-63c (d) after taking and subscribing to oath upon grand list; whether penalties imposed under § 12-63c (d) are required by law; whether term "assessment" in statute (§ 12-55 (b)) directing assessor to make any assessment omitted by mistake or required by law prior to signing grand list must be read to include penalties imposed under § 12-63c (d); whether assessor lacked authority to impose penalties under statute (§ 12-60) applicable to correction of clerical errors or mistakes.</i>	
Your Mansion Real Estate, LLC v. RCN Capital Funding, LLC (Order) . . . . .	908