

**Cumulative Table of Cases**  
**Connecticut Reports**  
**Volume 341**

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

Benjamin v. Corasaniti . . . . .	463
<i>Probate appeal; charitable trusts; whether trial court properly upheld decision of Probate Court, which concluded that donee had validly exercised his nongeneral testamentary powers of appointment under certain trusts established for his benefit by directing in his will that proceeds of sale of certain stock be distributed to charitable trust established by donee; whether unfunded charitable trust is permissible appointee of exercise of nongeneral testamentary power of appointment.</i>	
Benjamin v. Island Management, LLC. . . . .	189
<i>Request for information pursuant to provision (§ 34-255i (b) (2)) of Connecticut Uniform Limited Liability Company Act; alleged violation of defendant limited liability company's operating agreement; claim that, in order for investigation of mismanagement to be proper purpose, as required by § 34-255i (b) (2) (A), member of limited liability company must assert facts evidencing credible basis to infer that mismanagement may have occurred; claim that, in absence of credible proof requirement, there would be no basis to limit inspection to information directly connected to stated purpose of inspection, as is required by § 34-255i (b) (2) (C); claim that trial court was required to determine, pursuant to § 34-255i (b) (2) (C), that there was direct connection between each of the categories of information at issue and one of two specific purposes asserted in written demands for inspection of defendant's books and records but that it failed to engage in such analysis; claim that certain information sought at trial was not requested with reasonable particularity, as required by § 34-255i (b) (2) (B).</i>	
Daley v. Klein (Order) . . . . .	901
Day v. Seblatnigg . . . . .	815
<i>Conservatorships; declaratory judgment; summary judgment; application for voluntary appointment of conservator pursuant to statute ((Rev. to 2011) § 45a-646); certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's granting of plaintiff's motion for summary judgment; whether irrevocable trust created by voluntarily conserved person was void ab initio and unenforceable because, pursuant to statute ((Rev. to 2011) § 45a-655 (a)), authority to manage conserved person's estate rested exclusively with conservator.</i>	
Fajardo v. Boston Scientific Corp. . . . .	535
<i>Product liability; lack of informed consent; innocent, negligent and intentional misrepresentation; claim under Connecticut Product Liability Act (§ 52-572m et seq.) that allegedly defective design of transvaginal mesh sling manufactured by named defendant caused named plaintiff to suffer personal injuries; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment for defendant gynecologist and defendant medical practice in connection with plaintiffs' claim that gynecologist failed to obtain patient's informed consent to sling procedure, when gynecologist recommended and advised named plaintiff regarding risks of that procedure but referred her to specialist, who ultimately performed procedure; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment for defendant gynecologist and defendant medical practice in connection with plaintiffs' misrepresentation claims; claim that trial court improperly declined to instruct jury on reasonable alternative design prong of risk-utility test for product liability claims alleging design defect.</i>	
Goguen v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	508
<i>Habeas corpus; sexual assault in second degree; whether Appellate Court properly dismissed self-represented petitioner's appeal because he failed to brief that habeas court had abused its discretion in denying his petition for certification to appeal; claim that sex offender registration requirement relating to expired conviction satisfied requirement under federal habeas corpus law that petitioner be in custody at time petition was filed.</i>	

Gonzalez v. O & G Industries, Inc. . . . .	644
<i>Negligence; personal injuries plaintiff employees sustained in explosion that occurred at natural gas fueled power plant as result of defendants' alleged negligence in connection with construction of that power plant and use of "gas blow" procedure; strict liability; abnormally dangerous activity; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment with respect to strict liability claims by concluding that gas blow procedure was not abnormally dangerous activity; whether totality of six factors in § 520 of Restatement (Second) of Torts established that gas blow procedure was not abnormally dangerous; claim that significant risk would remain even after precautions are employed given inherently dangerous attributes of natural gas; claim that trial court improperly granted defendants' motions for summary judgment with respect to plaintiffs' negligence claims; whether trial court correctly concluded that defendants did not exercise sufficient control over general contractor's or its subcontractors' performance of gas blow procedure to overcome general rule that employer is not vicariously liable for torts of its independent contractor; whether defendants exercised sufficient contractual control over gas blow procedure to establish existence of legal duty; claim that, even in absence of any contractual control, defendants in fact exercised control over gas blow procedures by assuming control or interfering with work; claim that defendants were vicariously liable for general contractor's negligence because general contractor was engaged in intrinsically dangerous activity, which satisfied distinct exception to general rule that employer is not liable for torts of its independent contractor; claim that plaintiffs' negligence claims survived summary judgment because defendants were directly negligent.</i>	
Grabe v. Hokin. . . . .	360
<i>Dissolution of marriage; prenuptial agreement; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that enforcement of prenuptial agreement was not unconscionable in light of all relevant facts and circumstances, despite occurrence of unforeseen events during marriage; whether it was inconsistent for trial court to conclude that it would be unconscionable to enforce attorney's fees provision of agreement while also finding remainder of agreement enforceable in light of severability clause in agreement.</i>	
Jordan v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	279
<i>Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; claim that criminal trial counsel's performance was constitutionally deficient because she had failed to adequately investigate and to call six eyewitnesses whose testimony purportedly would have supported petitioner's self-defense claim; claim that trial counsel's performance was constitutionally deficient on ground that counsel had unreasonably failed to raise third-party culpability defense as result of her inadequate investigation and decision not to call certain witnesses; framework for inquiry into trial counsel's allegedly defective performance when trial counsel is unavailable to testify at habeas trial, discussed.</i>	
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Virgulak . . . . .	750
<i>Foreclosure; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's decision declining substitute plaintiff's request to reform mortgage deed executed by defendant property owner to reference fact that it was given to secure note executed by defendant's husband; whether absence of finding by trial court that parties intended mortgage deed signed by defendant to secure note was clearly erroneous; claim that, because mortgage deed referenced note with same date and in same amount as note that defendant's husband signed, note must be note defendant agreed to secure when she executed mortgage deed; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's determination that substitute plaintiff was not entitled to foreclose mortgage because defendant was not borrower on note; claim that foreclosure was proper equitable relief on grounds that it was undisputed that defendant entered into mortgage transaction and common sense dictated that she intended her property interest to serve as security for note contemporaneously executed by defendant's husband.</i>	
J. W. v. S. H. (Order) . . . . .	902
Klass v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. . . . .	735
<i>Application to compel appraisal to resolve dispute between parties concerning claim under homeowners insurance policy; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's motion to reargue and reconsider; whether trial court improperly granted plaintiff's motion to compel appraisal; claim that dispute</i>	

*as to extent of insurer’s replacement obligation pursuant to statute (§ 38a-316 (a)) was question of coverage to be resolved by court before insurance appraisal could proceed.*

L. H.-S. v. N. B. . . . . 483  
*Application for civil protection order pursuant to statute (§ 46b-16a); alleged stalking; appeal involving matter of substantial public interest pursuant to statute (§ 52-265a); claim that § 46b-16a was ambiguous with respect to whether to apply subjective-objective standard for determining whether applicant for civil protection order fears for his or her physical safety; claim that legislative history of statute supports objective-only standard; whether trial court improperly interpreted § 46b-16a as creating subjective-objective standard; whether trial court’s findings relating to whether plaintiff, in fact, feared for her physical safety were clearly erroneous; claim that trial court abused its discretion in excluding testimony that defendant had requested that plaintiff provide him with nude photographs and testimony regarding whether defendant ever had had suicidal thoughts or had taken medication for his mental health; unpreserved claim that § 46b-16a violated equal protection clause of Connecticut constitution; whether record was inadequate to review plaintiff’s state constitutional claim.*

Larmel v. Metro North Commuter Railroad Co. . . . . 332  
*Personal injury action; civil arbitration; certification from Appellate Court; whether plaintiff’s action filed after arbitration could be saved by accidental failure of suite statute (§ 52-592 (a)); whether plaintiff’s prior action was “tried on its merits” within meaning of § 52-592 (a).*

Nelson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . . 902

Pfister v. Madison Beach Hotel, LLC . . . . . 702  
*Zoning; permanent injunction; action seeking to enjoin defendants from hosting free outdoor concerts on strip of land in town park that was adjacent to property on which defendants’ hotel was situated; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly applied plenary review to trial court’s determination that hotel’s use of park for concerts illegally expanded hotel’s nonconforming use of hotel property; whether Crabtree Realty Co. v. Planning & Zoning Commission (82 Conn. App. 559) supported trial court’s determination; whether trial court applied incorrect legal standard; claim that Appellate Court misapplied actual use doctrine in concluding that concerts were permitted use in park; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that town zoning regulations, which limited use of park to all active and passive recreational purposes, permitted holding of concerts in park.*

Riccio v. Bristol Hospital, Inc. . . . . 772  
*Medical malpractice; accidental failure of suit statute (§ 52-592); claim that trial court erred in concluding that § 52-592 did not save plaintiff’s otherwise time barred action because her first medical malpractice action was dismissed due to her attorney’s gross negligence for failing to file legally sufficient medical opinion letters with her complaint; whether plaintiff met her burden of proving that her attorney’s lack of knowledge of and failure to comply with Appellate Court opinions that established requirements for legally sufficient medical opinion letters was mistake, inadvertence or excusable neglect rather than egregious conduct or gross negligence.*

Scholz v. Epstein . . . . . 1  
*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.*

Schoonmaker v. Cribbins (Order) . . . . . 901

South Windsor v. Lanata . . . . . 31  
*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.*

State v. A. B. . . . . 47  
*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.*

	<i>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>	
State v. Bermudez . . . . .		233
	<i>Felony murder; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court properly admitted evidence of gang affiliations of defendant, among others, and evidence of key state witness' relocation by state after witness provided written statement to police that implicated defendant in victim's death; whether gang affiliation evidence was probative to explain why witness feared defendant and defendant's brothers, who had participated in the charged crime, and why she waited twelve years before providing statement to police; whether trial court's limiting instruction minimized prejudicial impact of evidence; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that prejudicial effect of three salacious letters that witness had written to defendant outweighed their probative value; failure of defendant to establish that his constitutional rights to present defense and to confront witnesses against him were violated by trial court's decision to preclude admission of letters into evidence; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that defendant's claim that trial court had violated his constitutional rights by precluding defense counsel from questioning witness about circumstances surrounding termination of her employment and her birth control practices was not constitutional in nature and that trial court did not abuse its discretion in precluding those lines of inquiry.</i>	
State v. Bouvier (Order) . . . . .		903
State v. Bradley . . . . .		72
	<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 grievance 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>	
State v. Coltherst . . . . .		97
	<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>	
State v. Hughes . . . . .		387
	<i>Manslaughter first degree with firearm; criminal possession of firearm; self-defense; motion for new trial; claim that state presented insufficient evidence to satisfy its burden of disproving defendant's claim of self-defense beyond reasonable doubt; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion for new trial on ground that juror consulted dictionary for definition of "manslaughter"; applicability of presumption of prejudice articulated in Remmer v. United States (347 U.S. 227); whether defendant established his entitlement to presumption of prejudice; whether state satisfied its burden of proving that juror misconduct was harmless; whether juror misconduct caused actual prejudice to defendant.</i>	
State v. Lopez . . . . .		793
	<i>Violation of probation; whether evidence was sufficient to support trial court's finding that defendant, by possessing airsoft pellet gun, violated terms of his probation prohibiting him from violating state or federal criminal laws and from possessing</i>	

	<i>any firearm; claim that airsoft pellet gun could not be considered firearm within meaning of statute (§ 53a-3 (19)) that defines firearm as any weapon from which shot may be discharged.</i>	
State v. McKinney (Order) . . . . .		903
State v. Michael F. (Order). . . . .		901
State v. Streit. . . . .		170
	<i>Manslaughter 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>	
State v. Ward. . . . .		142
	<i>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.</i>	
Tillman v. Planning & Zoning Commission. . . . .		117
	<i>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.</i>	
Toro Credit Co. v. Zeytoonjian. . . . .		316
	<i>Foreclosure; order of foreclosure by sale; whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering foreclosure by sale of two parcels encumbered by one mortgage; whether defendants appealed from final judgment for purposes of appellate jurisdiction when trial court had determined method of foreclosure and amount of debt; whether trial court properly considered remedies provision in mortgage agreement as one factor in determining whether to order foreclosure by sale.</i>	
U.S. Bank, National Assn. v. Madison. . . . .		809
	<i>Foreclosure; bankruptcy; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court, in affirming trial court's judgment of strict foreclosure, improperly treated defense to foreclosure action as being same as claims and counterclaims, which are property of bankruptcy estate that must be disclosed in bankruptcy proceeding; appeal dismissed on ground that certification was improperly granted.</i>	
U.S. Bank Trust, N.A. v. Healey (Order) . . . . .		902
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Lorson . . . . .		430
	<i>Foreclosure; mortgages; judgment of strict foreclosure; certification from Appellate Court; whether compliance with applicable regulations of federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is condition precedent to accelerating payment of debt and foreclosing on mortgage that is guaranteed or insured by Federal Housing Administration; whether compliance with applicable HUD regulations must be pleaded and ultimately proven by plaintiff lender; claim that plaintiff's compliance with applicable HUD regulations was condition subsequent rather than condition precedent to foreclosure; claim that, even if compliance with applicable HUD regulations is condition precedent to foreclosure, defendant borrower still should shoulder burden of pleading and proving noncompliance as special defense; adoption of burden shifting procedure to be followed in cases in which plaintiff lender is required to comply with HUD regulations before seeking acceleration of debt and foreclosure; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that, even if plaintiff had burden to plead and prove compliance with applicable HUD regulations, evidence in record supported conclusion that plaintiff had met its burden.</i>	
White v. Commissioner of Correction (Order). . . . .		904
Woods v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .		506
	<i>Habeas corpus; murder; whether Appellate Court improperly dismissed petitioner's appeal from habeas court's dismissal of his petition for writ of habeas corpus; claim that Appellate Court improperly construed allegations in petition, which</i>	

*petitioner filed as self-represented party, in concluding that he failed to raise claim regarding ineffective assistance of prior habeas counsel; appeal dismissed on ground that certification was improvidently granted.*

Wright *v.* Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . . 903