

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 342

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Allstate Ins. Co. v. Tenn	292
<i>Declaratory judgment action; insurance; motion for summary judgment; certified question from United States District Court; whether plea of nolo contendere could be used by insurance company in declaratory judgment action to prove occurrence of criminal act that would trigger contractual exclusion to coverage under homeowners insurance policy.</i>	
Baker v. Cayo (Order)	911
Baker v. Shakir (Order) (See Baker v. Cayo)	911
Baltas v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	911
Berka v. Waterbury (Order)	902
Caverly v. State	226
<i>Wrongful death; medical malpractice; sovereign immunity; notice of claim for permission from claims commissioner to file action against state in connection with state employees' alleged negligence in prescribing certain medications to plaintiff's decedent; whether trial court properly denied state's motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on basis of sovereign immunity; whether plaintiff's medical malpractice claim against state was "indirectly paid by . . . a third party" within meaning of statute ((Rev. to 2017) § 4-160b (a)), when plaintiff brought and settled separate negligence action against pharmacy that had filled decedent's prescriptions.</i>	
Christiana Trust v. Bliss (Order)	902
Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities v. Edge Fitness, LLC	25
<i>Sex discrimination; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff commission's appeal from decision of commission's human rights referee; claim that defendant fitness facilities discriminated against complainants, who identified as males, on basis of sex by providing women's only workout areas in their otherwise public facilities, in violation of Public Accommodation Act (§ 46a-64); whether there was an implied customer gender privacy exception encompassed within § 46a-64 (b) (1), which exempts "separate bathrooms and locker rooms based on sex" from act's general prohibition against sex discrimination in public accommodations.</i>	
Connex Credit Union v. Thibodeau (Order)	903
Cordero v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	906
Crandle v. Connecticut State Employees Retirement Commission	67
<i>Administrative appeal; whether trial court properly dismissed appeal from ruling of defendant retirement commission; whether retirement commission incorrectly concluded that, under State Employees Retirement Act (§ 5-152 et seq.), state employee disability retirement benefits become payable on first day of month following receipt of application for such benefits by Retirement Services Division rather than on day following employee's last day of paid state employment; claim that trial court improperly deferred to commission's interpretation of State Employees Retirement Act because that interpretation was neither time-tested, insofar as it was not formally articulated or adopted pursuant to formal rule-making or adjudicatory procedures, nor reasonable; claim that retirement commission, as fiduciary of plaintiffs, former state employees, had burden of proving fair dealing by clear and convincing evidence with respect to commission's use of unwritten practice regarding when disability retirement benefits become payable.</i>	
Dorfman v. Smith	582
<i>Underinsured motorist benefits; breach of insurance contract; breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; negligent infliction of emotional distress; violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.) based on violation of Connecticut Unfair Insurance Practices Act (§ 38a-815 et seq.); whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's claims for breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, negligent infliction of emotional distress, and violation of CUTPA against defendant insurance company on</i>	

	<i>ground that litigation privilege barred those claims and deprived court of subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiff's claim that defendant's allegedly systemic abuse of judicial process challenged defendant's conduct in defending against underinsured motorist claim, rather than purpose of judicial proceedings; whether there existed safeguards other than civil liability to deter or preclude misconduct or to provide relief from defendant's alleged misconduct.</i>	
1st Alliance Lending, LLC v. Dept. of Banking		273
	<i>Mortgage lending; automatic suspension and revocation of plaintiff's license to serve as mortgage lender in Connecticut; whether statute (§ 36a-492) directing Commissioner of Banking to suspend license of mortgage lender when its surety bond is cancelled, unless lender has surrendered its license, and relevant statutory scheme, provided commissioner with legal authority to suspend and revoke plaintiff's mortgage lender license; whether commissioner should not be permitted to decline to take action on mortgage lender's request to surrender its license; whether trial court correctly concluded that Department of Banking was not estopped from suspending and revoking plaintiff's mortgage lender license on basis of representations that department made in letter to plaintiff.</i>	
Goodwin v. Fedus (Order)		902
High Ridge Real Estate Owner, LLC v. Board of Representatives.		423
	<i>Administrative appeal; zoning; whether board of representatives lacked authority, under city charter, to determine validity of protest petition opposing amendment to zoning regulations by city zoning board; whether protest petition was valid; whether protest petition contained requisite number of signatures under city charter; whether board of representatives had authority to consider merits of zoning board's decision to amend zoning regulations.</i>	
HSBC Bank USA, N.A. v. Cardinal (Order).		908
In re Emily S. (Order).		911
In re Ivory W.		692
	<i>Termination of parental rights; motion for continuance; claim that trial court deprived respondent of her due process rights under federal and state constitutions when it denied her motion for continuance of termination of parental rights proceeding pending conclusion of related federal criminal proceeding; whether specific analytical framework of United States Supreme Court's penalty cases governed this court's analysis of respondent's federal due process claim; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying respondent's motion for continuance; respondent's request that this court exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to require trial courts to grant motions for continuance of termination of parental rights proceedings whenever respondent has invoked his or her fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination in connection with related criminal proceeding.</i>	
In re Onyx K.-A. (Order)		907
In re Petition of Reapportionment Commission Ex Rel.		271
	<i>Reapportionment; submission of report and plan by court-appointed special master for redistricting of state's congressional districts; order adopting report and plan.</i>	
In re Riley B.		333
	<i>Motion to intervene in juvenile case filed by biological mother of minor child after her parental rights with respect to child were terminated in effort to seek posttermination visitation order; dismissal of motion to intervene on grounds of res judicata; whether biological mother had party status necessary to support this court's jurisdiction over appeal from dismissal of motion to intervene; whether mother had colorable claim to intervention as of right in child's juvenile case; appeal dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.</i>	
Kiyak v. Dept. of Agriculture (Order).		909
Marshall v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles (Order)		912
McLoughlin v. Planning & Zoning Commission		737
	<i>Zoning; appeal from decision of defendant planning and zoning commission denying plaintiffs' application for special permit to construct crematory in industrial zone; claim that Appellate Court misinterpreted and improperly expanded its holding in St. Joseph's High School, Inc. v. Planning & Zoning Commission (176 Conn. App. 570), in which Appellate Court concluded that planning and zoning commission may deny special permit application on basis of noncompliance with general standards contained in zoning regulations; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that planning and zoning commission's denial of plaintiffs' special permit application was supported by substantial evidence;</i>	

whether evidence relied on by planning and zoning commission in denying plaintiffs' special permit application constituted fact based and site specific evidence or mere worry and speculation.

O. A. v. J. A.	45
<i>Dissolution of marriage; pendente lite orders of alimony, attorney's fees, and expert fees; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that it did not need to consider enforceability of parties' postnuptial agreement prior to awarding plaintiff pendente lite alimony and litigation expenses; whether trial court properly relied on Fitzgerald v. Fitzgerald (169 Conn. 147) and acted within its discretion in deferring its decision on enforceability of parties' postnuptial agreement until end of trial.</i>	
Peek v. Manchester Memorial Hospital	103
<i>Negligence; statute of limitations ((Rev. to 2015) § 52-584); motion for summary judgment; claim that plaintiff's action was barred by two year limitation period set forth in § 52-584; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly construed term "injury" in § 52-584 to mean actionable harm, consistent with this court's decision in Lagassey v. State (268 Conn. 723); whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that, viewing facts in light most favorable to plaintiff, there was genuine issue of material fact regarding whether plaintiff commenced her action within two years from date of her "injury," as that term is understood in context of § 52-584; claim that Appellate Court improperly applied failure to diagnose or latent injury cases to facts of this case; claim that facts of present case were similar to those in Burns v. Hartford Hospital (192 Conn. 451), in which court determined that limitation period set forth in § 52-584 started running when plaintiff sustained injuries; claim that this court in Lagassey improperly neglected to apply statutory (§ 1-2z) plain meaning rule and to interpret term "injury" in § 52-584 to mean hurt, damage, or loss sustained.</i>	
Poce v. O & G Industries, Inc. (Order)	910
Ponns Cohen v. Cohen	354
<i>Dissolution of marriage; appeal from judgment of dissolution; unreserved claim that trial court improperly prejudged plaintiff's credibility and displayed judicial bias during dissolution proceedings; whether plain error doctrine required reversal of trial court's judgment; whether certain of court's comments directed to plaintiff during dissolution proceedings constituted obvious error resulting in manifest injustice.</i>	
Reid v. Speer (Order)	908
Smulley v. Safeco Ins. Co. of Illinois (Order)	907
Speer v. Teiger (Order)	903
State v. Alvarez (Order)	905
State v. Andres C. (Order)	901
State v. Belcher	1
<i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; kidnapping first degree; sexual assault first degree; robbery first degree; burglary first degree; attempt to commit sexual assault first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that sentencing court substantially relied on materially false information in sentencing defendant, in violation of his right to due process; claim that sentencing court's reliance on superpredator theory, concerning rise of teenage male predatory street criminals who would terrorize society, and sentencing court's characterization of defendant as charter member of that group of superpredators, warranted resentencing.</i>	
State v. Bruny	169
<i>Murder; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; claim that trial court abused its discretion in admitting testimony of four lay witnesses identifying defendant as one of persons depicted in surveillance video of interior and exterior of nightclub where shooting took place insofar as their testimony improperly embraced ultimate issue to be decided by jury, in violation of Connecticut Code of Evidence (§ 7-3 (a)); claim that trial court improperly admitted expert testimony of forensic examiner regarding enhanced video that he compiled from raw surveillance footage of nightclub where shooting took place, insofar as examiner's testimony invaded province of jury; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that defense counsel had opened door to certain of forensic examiner's testimony on redirect examination; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying defendant's request for special credibility instruction as to witness who defendant claimed should have been treated as jailhouse informant; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to suppress out-of-court and in-court identifications</i>	

	<i>of defendant made by victim's cousin; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support defendant's conviction of criminal possession of pistol or revolver insofar as state failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt that gun used in shooting had barrel length of less than twelve inches.</i>	
State v. Carrillo (Order)		909
State v. Daniels		538
	<i>Intentional manslaughter first degree; reckless manslaughter first degree; misconduct with motor vehicle; certification from Appellate Court; claim that jury's guilty verdict was legally inconsistent in that each offense required mutually exclusive mental states; whether Appellate Court, having found that defendant's conviction of reckless manslaughter and misconduct with motor vehicle was legally inconsistent, improperly ordered new trial on those counts and intentional manslaughter conviction, which trial court had vacated pursuant to State v. Polanco (308 Conn. 242), rather than reinstating defendant's vacated intentional manslaughter conviction; whether defendant's conviction of intentional manslaughter and reckless manslaughter was legally inconsistent; whether defendant's conviction of intentional manslaughter and misconduct with motor vehicle was legally inconsistent.</i>	
State v. Fisher		239
	<i>Assault second degree; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support defendant's conviction of assault in second degree; whether jury reasonably could have found beyond reasonable doubt that defendant had intended to cause victim to suffer serious physical injury; claim that trial court improperly limited defense counsel's cross-examination of victim regarding her pending civil action against defendant, which arose out of same incident that formed basis for defendant's conviction; claim that trial court improperly precluded admission of complaint in victim's civil action against defendant; whether claimed error was of constitutional magnitude; claim that trial court improperly allowed certain witness to provide expert testimony regarding symptoms of concussions.</i>	
State v. Gore		129
	<i>Murder; criminal possession of firearm; claim that trial court improperly admitted police officer's testimony regarding witness' statement identifying defendant in still photograph taken from surveillance video on ground that it constituted lay opinion testimony embracing ultimate issue to be decided by trier of fact; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion for mistrial and new trial based on alleged juror misconduct.</i>	
State v. Gray		657
	<i>Felony murder; attempt to commit robbery first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery first degree; carrying pistol without permit; unpreserved claim that trial court had violated defendant's federal constitutional right to due process by detaining material witnesses who were reluctant to testify, pursuant to material witness statute (§ 54-82j) or capias statute (§ 52-143 (e)) in order to secure their attendance at trial; whether detention of witnesses had coercive influence over substance of witnesses' testimony, rather than mere effect of having them appear in court; claim that trial court improperly admitted, pursuant to State v. Whelan (200 Conn. 743), witnesses' grand jury testimony; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting portions of grand jury testimony that were consistent with witnesses' in-court testimony so as to avoid confusing jury; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting transcripts of witnesses' grand jury testimony after prosecutor reenacted that testimony in court.</i>	
State v. Holmes (Order)		909
State v. James K. (Order)		904
State v. Jose A. B.		489
	<i>Sexual assault first degree; sexual assault fourth degree; attempt to commit sexual assault first degree; risk of injury to child; claim that trial court improperly overruled objections, pursuant to Batson v. Kentucky (476 U.S. 79), to prosecutor's use of peremptory challenges to excuse two prospective jurors who were members of a racial minority; whether prospective juror's distrust of law enforcement and/or criminal justice system constitutes race neutral reason for exercising peremptory challenge under Connecticut constitution; Batson reform in Connecticut, including report by Jury Selection Task Force, appointed by Chief Justice pursuant to State v. Holmes (334 Conn. 202), proposing new rule of practice to address role of implicit bias and disparate impact on basis of race or ethnicity in jury selection; whether prosecutor's proffered explanations for peremptory challenges were pretext for discrimination; claim that sexual assault in first</i>	

degree and sexual assault in fourth degree constituted same offense as risk of injury to child under Blockburger v. United States (284 U.S. 299), notwithstanding distinct elements of each of those offenses, because of how each charge was alleged by state in information.

State v. Marshall (Order) 901

State v. McCarthy (Order) 910

State v. Omar (Order) 906

State v. Patel 445

Murder; home invasion; burglary first degree as accessory; robbery first degree as accessory; conspiracy to commit burglary first degree; tampering with physical evidence; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had properly admitted dual inculpatory statement made by codefendant to codefendant's fellow inmate; whether admission of codefendant's statement violated defendant's confrontation rights under United States or Connecticut constitution; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting codefendant's statement as statement against penal interest under applicable provision (§ 8-6 (4)) of Connecticut Code of Evidence; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had properly excluded confession made by defendant's cousin to defendant's sister, which defendant offered as statement against penal interest under § 8-6 (4).

State v. Reed (Order) 904

State v. Rosario (Order) 901

State v. Smith (Order) 905

State v. Taveras 563

Violation of probation; breach of peace second degree; first amendment; true threats; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that defendant's remarks warranted protection under first amendment to United States constitution; whether Appellate Court improperly reversed judgments of trial court revoking defendant's probation.

Strand/BRC Group, LLC v. Board of Representatives. 365

Administrative appeal; land use; whether trial court correctly concluded that defendant board of representatives lacked authority under city charter to verify validity of petition protesting planning board's approval of amendment to city's master plan; whether board of representatives had authority under city charter to consider merits of amendment to master plan when petition protesting that amendment was invalid.

Tatoian v. Tyler (Order) 908

Walzer v. Walzer (Order) 907