

**Cumulative Table of Cases**  
**Connecticut Reports**  
**Volume 344**

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

Bennetta v. Derby (Order) . . . . .	903
Costanzo v. Plainfield . . . . .	86
<i>Action against defendant town and defendant town employees to recover damages for drowning in pool on private property; allegations that defendants issued building permit for pool prior to inspecting it to ensure that safety features required by state building code were installed; certification from Appellate Court; whether trial court's orders sustaining plaintiff's objections to defendants' apportionment complaint and notice of intent to seek apportionment constituted final judgment permitting interlocutory appellate review; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had improperly sustained plaintiff's objections to defendants' apportionment complaint and notice of intent to seek apportionment; whether plaintiff's allegations fell within first exception to municipal immunity in statute (§ 52-557n (b) (8)) that subjects municipality to liability for injuries that occur as result of failure to inspect or inadequate or negligent inspection of property to determine whether property complies with or violates any law or contains health or safety hazard when municipality had notice of such violation of law or such hazard; whether plaintiff's allegations fell within purview of statute (§ 52-572h (o)) permitting liability to be apportioned among parties liable for negligence in any cause of action created by statute based on negligence.</i>	
Garcia v. Cohen . . . . .	84
<i>Negligence; premises liability; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court had committed reversible error by failing to instruct jury on nondelegable duty doctrine; appeal dismissed on ground that certification was improvidently granted.</i>	
In re Madison C. (Order) . . . . .	903
International Investors v. Town Plan & Zoning Commission . . . . .	46
<i>Zoning; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that defendant plan and zoning commission was authorized by statute (§ 8-2 (a)) to condition approval of special permit on completion of development within specified time period and that special permit approval expired two years after its effective date because construction had not yet been completed; whether commission lacked authority to condition continuing validity of special permit on completion of development within specified period of time that conflicted with time limitation prescribed by statute (§ 8-3) for satisfying the same condition.</i>	
Pistello-Jones v. Jones (Order) . . . . .	901
Sakon v. Sakonchick (Order) . . . . .	901
State v. Council . . . . .	113
<i>Murder; criminal possession of firearm; whether trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to present defense by precluding testimony of certain expert witness; whether trial court improperly excluded testimony of expert witness because witness was qualified as expert under rules of evidence; whether appeal was moot when defendant failed to challenge all independent bases for trial court's adverse ruling.</i>	
State v. Davis . . . . .	122
<i>Murder; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that defendant had failed to establish that defense counsel was burdened by actual conflict of interest that adversely affected her performance; whether defense counsel's prior representation of victim's son created actual conflict of interest; whether trial court's finding of facts, including that defense counsel's brief representation of victim's son had no effect on course of trial, were clearly erroneous; whether counsel's prior representation of relative of victim in criminal case creates per se conflict of interest; claim that trial court improperly admitted into evidence testimony from three lay witnesses identifying defendant in surveillance video footage; whether,</i>	

*under rule established in State v. Gore (343 Conn. 129), trial court abused its discretion in admitting challenged testimony; whether it was proper for this court to apply rule established in Gore retroactively to present case.*

State v. Herman K. (Order). . . . . 902

State v. Juan F. . . . . 33

*Sexual assault first degree; risk of injury to child; whether trial court improperly denied defendant's pretrial motion to dismiss for failure to prosecute within five year limitation period set forth in applicable statute of limitations ((Rev. to 2001) § 54-193a); whether trial court's finding that defendant was not available for arrest between issuance and execution of arrest warrant was not clearly erroneous.*

State v. Juan J. . . . . 1

*Sexual assault first degree; attempt to commit sexual assault first degree; risk of injury to child; claim that trial court had abused its discretion in admitting evidence of defendant's uncharged misconduct in connection with allegations of sexual abuse; unpreserved claim by state that judgment of conviction could be affirmed on alternative ground that uncharged misconduct evidence was admissible to show propensity under applicable provision (§ 4-5 (b)) of Connecticut Code of Evidence; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting uncharged misconduct evidence under applicable provision (§ 4-5 (c)) of Connecticut Code of Evidence to show intent and absence of mistake or accident on part of defendant; whether admission of uncharged misconduct evidence was harmful.*

Willis W. v. Office of Adult Probation (Order). . . . . 902

Wind Colebrook South, LLC v. Colebrook . . . . . 150

*Tax appeal; appeal from assessment of real property taxes on basis that property was overvalued and overassessed; claim that assessor of defendant town improperly classified plaintiff's wind turbines and associated equipment as real property pursuant to statute (§ 12-64 (a)) rather than as personal property pursuant to statute (§ 12-41 (c)); whether trial court correctly concluded that wind turbines constitute "buildings" or "structures" pursuant to § 12-64 (a); whether wind turbines and their associated equipment were taxable under "fixtures of . . . electric . . . companies" provision of § 12-41 (c); whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiff did not establish its allegations of overvaluation and over-assessment.*