

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 341

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

<p>Scholz v. Epstein <i>Statutory theft; litigation privilege; certification from Appellate Court; whether litigation privilege afforded defendant attorney absolute immunity from liability for statutory (§ 52-564) theft in connection with prior judicial proceeding in which defendant represented company foreclosing on plaintiff's property; claim that litigation privilege was inapplicable to extent that defendant's recording of certificate of foreclosure on land records and role in sale of property purportedly fell outside scope of foreclosure action.</i></p>	1
<p>South Windsor v. Lanata <i>Zoning; legal impossibility; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly remanded case for new trial as to liability, rather than proceeding limited to damages.</i></p>	31
<p>State v. A. B. <i>Possession of child pornography first degree; motion to dismiss information; whether trial court properly granted defendant's motion to dismiss; claim that delay in executing arrest warrant was unreasonable under State v. Crawford (202 Conn. 443); whether trial court incorrectly concluded that applicable statute of limitations ((Rev. to 2009) § 54-193 (b)) was not tolled by tolling provision of § 54-193 (c).</i></p>	47
<p>State v. Bradley <i>Sale of controlled substance; violation of probation; motions to dismiss; standing; certification from Appellate Court; claim that defendant had standing, in his individual capacity, to raise constitutional challenge to his conviction of sale of controlled substance in violation of statute ((Rev. to 2017) § 21a-277 (b)) on ground that statute violated equal protection clause of federal constitution insofar as legislature enacted it for purpose of discriminating against African Americans and Mexican Americans; claim that defendant had established classical aggravement under State v. Long (268 Conn. 508) insofar as he was charged, prosecuted, and convicted under unconstitutional statute; whether defendant lacked standing to claim that § 21a-277 (b) violated equal protection rights of other racial and ethnic groups.</i></p>	72
<p>State v. Coltherst <i>Capital felony; murder; felony murder; kidnapping first degree; robbery first degree; robbery second degree; larceny first degree; conspiracy to commit kidnapping first degree; larceny fourth degree; motion to correct illegal sentence; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court followed statutory (§ 54-91g) requirements in resentencing defendant; whether and when defendant, who was serving two distinct total effective sentences of eighty-five years of imprisonment and eighty years of imprisonment, to run consecutively, will be eligible for parole under applicable statutes (§§ 53a-38 (b) (2) and 54-125a (f) (1)); claim that § 54-91g applied to defendant; whether defendant met conditions under § 54-91g that restrict its application to child whose case has been transferred from juvenile docket to regular criminal docket and who has been convicted of class A or B felony pursuant to such transfer; whether § 54-91g applied retroactively to defendant.</i></p>	97
<p>State v. Streit <i>Manlaughter first degree; claim that trial court abused its discretion by denying motion seeking to introduce evidence, in support of defendant's self-defense claim, that victim had searched retail website for weapons in days preceding stabbing; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that evidence of victim's Internet searches was inadmissible evidence of victim's violent character; whether victim's online search history was admissible as prior act of misconduct.</i></p>	170

State v. Ward. 142
Manslaughter first degree; assault first degree; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over defendant's motion to correct illegal sentence on ground that he failed to allege colorable challenge, within scope of applicable rule of practice (§ 43-22), to sentencing procedure rather than underlying conviction.

Tillman v. Planning & Zoning Commission. 117
*Zoning; planned development districts; claim that zoning authority conferred by statute (§ 8-2) did not support creation of planned development district; claim that this court's decision in *Campion v. Board of Aldermen* (278 Conn. 500), did not permit municipalities that derive their zoning authority from § 8-2 to create planned development districts; claim that planned development district proposed by defendant violated uniformity requirement of § 8-2; whether defendant planning and zoning commission's decision resulted in unlawful subdivision.*