

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 347

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Adesokan v. Bloomfield	416
<i>Negligence; negligent supervision; respondeat superior; summary judgment; discretionary act immunity for municipalities and their employees; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that statute (§ 14-283 (d)) governing operation of emergency vehicles imposed discretionary, rather than ministerial, duty on police officer to drive with due regard for safety of all persons and property, for purposes of statutory (§ 52-557n (a) (2) (B)) governmental immunity; whether statutory defense of discretionary act governmental immunity applies as matter of law to claims arising from manner in which emergency vehicle is operated in light of common-law duty to drive with due regard for safety of all persons and property, as codified by statute (§ 14-283 (d)).</i>	
ARVYS Protein, Inc. v. A/F Protein, Inc. (Order)	905
Banks v. Commissioner of Correction	335
<i>Habeas corpus; denial of petition for certification to appeal from habeas court's dismissal of petitioner's habeas petition; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly dismissed petitioner's appeal from habeas court's denial of petition for certification to appeal; whether statutory (§ 52-470 (g)) certification requirement bars appellate review of unpreserved claims under plain error doctrine or State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233), when unpreserved claims were not raised before habeas court or included in petition for certification to appeal.</i>	
Bosque v. Commissioner of Correction	377
<i>Habeas corpus; denial of petition for certification to appeal from habeas court's dismissal of petitioner's habeas petition; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly dismissed appeal from habeas court's denial of petition for certification to appeal; whether statutory (§ 52-470 (g)) certification requirement bars appellate review of unpreserved claims under plain error doctrine or State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233), when unpreserved claims were not included in petition for certification to appeal; decision in companion case, Banks v. Commissioner of Correction (347 Conn. 335), dispositive of appeal.</i>	
Carter v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	906
Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities v. Cantillon	58
<i>Administrative appeal; housing discrimination on basis of race; claim that human rights referee's award of \$15,000 in damages to complainant for emotional distress was insufficient; claim that, under Patino v. Birken Mfg. Co. (304 Conn. 679), any award for garden-variety emotional distress damages presumptively must be at least \$30,000; whether lack of floor on emotional distress damages awards that is consistent with lower end of prevailing range of awards in Second Circuit would create forum shopping issue; whether referee incorrectly applied and expanded three factor test that Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities adopted in its prior decision in Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities ex rel. Harrison v. Greco for calculating emotional distress damages.</i>	
Commissioner of Mental Health & Addiction Services v. Freedom of Information Commission	675
<i>Administrative appeal; request pursuant to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) that plaintiffs disclose police report concerning death of patient after medical event at Whiting Forensic Division of Connecticut Valley Hospital; whether police report was exempt from disclosure under provision (§ 1-210 (b) (10)) of FOIA that exempts from disclosure communications privileged by doctor-patient or therapist-patient relationship or any other common-law or statutory privilege; whether police report, which was prepared by agency police officers who responded to medical event, was privileged pursuant to statutory (§§ 52-146d (2) and 52-146e (a)) psychiatrist-patient privilege; whether there was substantial evidence to support commission's finding that police report was not communication or record</i>	

thereof, as defined by § 52-146d (2); whether disclosure of police report contravened Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. § 1320d et seq.), as implemented by Privacy Rule (45 C.F.R. § 160.101 et seq.).

Deutsche Bank Trust Co. Americas v. Burke (Order) 904

Direct Energy Services, LLC v. Public Utilities Regulatory Authority 101
Administrative appeal; appeal from judgment of trial court upholding final decision of defendant Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA), which imposed geographic and marketing restrictions on certain voluntary renewable energy products offered by plaintiff electric suppliers; claim that geographic restriction, which prohibited energy suppliers from offering Connecticut customers voluntary products that included renewable energy credits sourced outside of particular geographic regions, and marketing restriction, which required energy suppliers to provide certain language to customers regarding nature of voluntary products, violated dormant commerce clause; reviewability of claims that marketing restriction violated plaintiffs’ constitutional right to free speech and that PURA’s final decision violated plaintiffs’ constitutional right to freely contract; claim that PURA failed to satisfy procedural requirements of Uniform Administrative Procedure Act (§ 4-166 et seq.).

Escobar-Santana v. State 601
Medical malpractice; sovereign immunity; whether trial court properly denied state’s motion to dismiss count of plaintiffs’ complaint alleging that plaintiff mother suffered purely emotional distress arising out injuries sustained by minor child during labor and delivery process owing to defendant’s alleged medical malpractice; claim that count of complaint for plaintiff mother’s purely emotional distress alleged something other than medical malpractice and, therefore, did not fall within statutory (§ 4-160 (f)) waiver of state’s sovereign immunity; whether term “medical malpractice claims” in § 4-160 (f) was broad enough to encompass birthing mother’s allegation that she suffered emotional distress from physical injuries to her child that had been proximately caused by negligence of health care providers during birthing process; whether count of complaint that alleged that birthing mother suffered emotional distress could be read to allege cause of action for medical malpractice.

Hartford Police Dept. v. Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities 241
Employment discrimination; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly reversed judgment of trial court, which upheld decision of defendant Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities that defendant employee had proven intentional discrimination based on ancestry by plaintiff employer; whether defendant employee failed to establish prima facie case of employment discrimination; whether human rights referee’s finding of intentional discrimination was supported by substantial evidence.

High Watch Recovery Center, Inc. v. Dept. of Public Health 317
Administrative appeal; subject matter jurisdiction; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that decision of defendant Department of Public Health was not final decision in contested case and, therefore, that trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over appeal; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that plaintiff’s petition requesting intervenor status in public hearing on certificate of need application was not legally sufficient request for public hearing for purposes of applicable statute ((Rev. to 2017) § 19a-639a (e)); whether, to satisfy numerical requirements of § 19a-639a (e), plaintiff was required to expressly state in its petition to intervene that it was entity with five or more people; whether plaintiff’s petition to intervene was written request for public hearing within meaning of § 19a-639a (e).

In re Amanda C. (Order) 904

In re Cameron H. (Order) 903

In re Cole. 284
Bankruptcy; appeal from decision of United States Bankruptcy Court for District of Connecticut finding that debtor was entitled to statutory (§ 52-352b (21)) homestead exemption of \$250,000; certification of question of law from United States District Court for District of Connecticut; whether public act (P.A. 21-161) expanding homestead exemption from \$75,000 to \$250,000 applied in bankruptcy proceedings filed after effective date of act when debts that were subject of bankruptcy proceedings accrued prior to that date; whether applicability of homestead exemption set forth in P.A. 21-161, as recognized under federal statute (11 U.S.C. § 522 (b) (3) (A)) that specifies what property can be exempted from debtor’s chapter 7 bankruptcy estate, is determined by federal bankruptcy law or state

	<i>law for choice of law purposes; claim that P.A. 21-161 contained implicit carve-out for debts accrued prior to act's effective date because legislature included such carve-out in public act (P.A. 93-301) that originally created homestead exemption and because failure to find such carve-out for preexisting debts would improperly give act retroactive effect without express authorization of legislature.</i>	
In re Daniel D. (Order)		906
In re Fayth C. (Order)		907
In re Gabriel S.		223
	<i>Termination of parental rights; claim that respondent father's constitutional due process right to adequate notice of grounds for termination of his parental rights was violated; whether respondent's due process rights were violated when trial court allowed petitioner, Commissioner of Children and Families, to amend petition for termination after close of evidence; whether respondent's due process rights were violated when trial court terminated his parental rights pursuant to statutory provision (§ 17a-112 (j) (3) (B) (ii)) that petitioner had included in amended statement of facts but not in either original or amended petition for termination; whether respondent received adequate notice of grounds for terminating his parental rights under facts of case.</i>	
In re Paulo T.		311
	<i>Child custody; guardianship; motion for reinstatement of guardianship rights; certification from Appellate Court; whether presumption that reinstatement of guardianship rights is in best interests of child applies in cases in which both parties are parent of minor child; whether trial court applied presumption that reinstatement of guardianship rights is in best interests of child in deciding petitioner's motion.</i>	
In re Prince S. (Order)		907
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Lakner		476
	<i>Foreclosure; motion for protective order after discovery request; certification from Appellate Court; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting plaintiff mortgagee's motion for protective order; whether trial court correctly concluded that defendant mortgagor's request for documents contained in plaintiff's mortgage file would not lead to discovery of admissible evidence; whether trial court correctly concluded that defendant's request seeking production of plaintiff's mortgage file was overly broad; whether defendant satisfied his burden of establishing that he was harmed by trial court's erroneous decision to grant defendant's motion for protective order; claim that, trial court's error was harmless because it was defendant's burden to prove his special defense of payment and because nothing in protective order prevented defendant from proving his special defense with his own evidence.</i>	
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Leszczynski (Order)		903
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Malick		155
	<i>Foreclosure; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly reversed trial court's judgment of strict foreclosure; claim that, in determining amount of debt owed by defendant, trial court improperly relied on affidavit of debt filed by plaintiff bank, pursuant to rule of practice (§ 23-18 (a)), instead of requiring plaintiff to present evidence as to amount of debt; whether defendant's objection to plaintiff's affidavit of debt on ground that plaintiff incorrectly calculated taxes and interest owed constituted specific objection concerning amount of debt stated in affidavit; whether defendant's objection to amount of interest and taxes listed in affidavit of debt precluded trial court from relying on affidavit of debt filed by plaintiff pursuant to § 23-18 (a), which permits amount of debt in foreclosure action to be proven by affidavit only when "no defense as to the amount of the mortgage debt is interposed"; whether objection to affidavit of debt under § 23-18 (a) must be accompanied by supporting, admissible evidence, in addition to legal or factual argument.</i>	
KeyBank, N.A. v. Yazar		381
	<i>Foreclosure; Emergency Mortgage Assistance Program (EMAP); whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that statutorily (§ 8-265e (a)) required EMAP notice implicates court's subject matter jurisdiction; whether EMAP notice requirement is mandatory condition precedent to filing of foreclosure action; whether § 8-265e (a) requires that mortgagee provide EMAP notice for each foreclosure action initiated, even when multiple foreclosure actions are based on same default under same mortgage.</i>	

Khan v. Yale University	1
<i>Defamation; tortious interference with business relations; motion to dismiss; appeal to United States Court of Appeals for Second Circuit from dismissal of certain counts of plaintiff's complaint by United States District Court for District of Connecticut; certification of questions of law from Second Circuit pursuant to statute (§ 51-199b (d)); requirements that must be satisfied for adjudicative proceeding to be recognized as quasi-judicial for purposes of affording absolute immunity to proceeding participants for statements made during proceeding, discussed; factors that courts are to consider in determining whether proceeding is quasi-judicial, discussed; whether disciplinary hearing convened by named defendant university in connection with sexual assault allegations against plaintiff was quasi-judicial proceeding for purposes of affording absolute immunity to alleged victim for statements she made during proceeding; whether, under Connecticut law, qualified immunity is available to alleged victims of sexual assault who report their abuse to proper authorities at institutions of higher education; whether plaintiff alleged sufficient facts in his complaint that alleged victim acted with malice when making statements at issue to defeat victim's qualified privilege at motion to dismiss stage.</i>	
Maia v. Commissioner of Correction	449
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court correctly determined that petitioner's trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to advise petitioner to accept plea offer by court, which included a sentence of forty-five years of imprisonment, in exchange for guilty plea to crime of murder when court imposed maximum sentence of sixty years of imprisonment after petitioner was convicted at trial; factors to be considered in determining whether defense counsel should recommend that defendant accept a plea offer, discussed; Sanders v. Commissioner of Correction (169 Conn. App. 813), to extent that it requires defense counsel to provide defendant with opinion as to what plea to enter, overruled.</i>	
Manginelli v. Regency House of Wallingford, Inc.	581
<i>Wrongful death; motion to dismiss; claim by defendants, who operated nursing home, that they were entitled to immunity from suit and liability under executive order (Executive Order No. 7V, § 6) issued by governor amid COVID-19 pandemic; whether trial court properly denied defendants' motion to dismiss; standard for determining whether health care provider is entitled to immunity under executive order for acts and omissions that formed basis for plaintiff's compensable injury, discussed; whether defendants established necessary connection between alleged acts and omissions that allegedly caused injuries sustained by plaintiff's decedent and alleged lack of resources attributable to COVID-19 pandemic.</i>	
Mills v. Hartford HealthCare Corp.	524
<i>Wrongful death; negligence; gross negligence; diagnosis and treatment of patient who was suspected of having a medical condition related to COVID-19 but who later tested negative for COVID-19; motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly dismissed certain counts of plaintiff's complaint on ground that defendant physicians and defendant hospital were entitled to immunity from suit and liability under executive order (Executive Order No. 7V, § 6) issued by governor amid COVID-19 pandemic; whether trial court properly dismissed certain counts of complaint on ground that defendants were entitled immunity from suit and liability under federal Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act (42 U.S.C. § 247d-6d); whether defendants demonstrated nexus between acts and omissions that allegedly caused injuries sustained by plaintiff's decedent and defendants' provision of health care services in support of state's COVID-19 response; whether, for purposes of 42 U.S.C. § 247d-6d, defendants' alleged negligence was causally related to or arose out of administration or use of covered pandemic countermeasure, such as COVID-19 diagnostic test.</i>	
Norwich v. Brenton Family Trust (Order)	906
Pascarella v. Silver (Order)	901
Roach v. Transwaste, Inc.	405
<i>Wrongful termination of employment; damages; remittitur; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly upheld trial court's denial of defendant's motion for remittitur; reasonable certainty standard of proof, discussed; whether jury's damages award for lost wages was supported by sufficient evidence; claim that plaintiff did not prove his lost wages with reasonable certainty because only evidence he offered was his own generalized and nonspecific testimony; whether plaintiff's testimony was sufficient to remove damages award from realm of speculation.</i>	

Schoenhorn v. Moss	501
<i>Writ of mandamus; subject matter jurisdiction; justiciability; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's action for writ of mandamus for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiff's action was justiciable; whether trial court could afford any practical relief to plaintiff in mandamus action seeking to compel defendant chief court reporter to produce transcripts that were sealed by family court in marital dissolution action involving different parties; whether mandamus action was impermissible collateral attack on family court's sealing order; claim that collateral attack on family court's sealing order was permissible on ground that sealing order was void ab initio.</i>	
Speer v. New London (Order)	903
Stamford Property Holdings, LLC v. Jashari (Order)	901
Stanley v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	902
Stanley v. Quiros (Order)	901
Stanziale v. Hunt (Order)	905
State v. Avoletta	629
<i>Declaratory judgment; summary judgment; public emolument clause of Connecticut constitution (art. I, § 1); certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that special act (S.A. 17-4, § 1) authorizing defendants to present claim against state to Claims Commissioner after statute of limitations (§ 4-148 (a)) had lapsed constituted unconstitutional public emolument that violated article first, § 1, of state constitution; whether S.A. 17-4 served legitimate public purpose when state itself did not bear responsibility for defendants' procedural default.</i>	
State v. Ebron (Order)	902
State v. James K.	648
<i>Risk of injury to child; certification from Appellate Court; whether trial court improperly limited defense counsel's questioning of prospective jurors during voir dire and whether such limitation resulted in harmful prejudice to defendant; standard for determining when trial court's exercise of discretion in restricting voir dire results in reversible error; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting video recording of victim's forensic interview; whether probative value of video recording of forensic interview was outweighed by its prejudicial effect.</i>	
State v. Lanier	179
<i>Burglary second degree; certification from Appellate Court; whether limitations trial court had imposed on defense counsel's cross-examination of victim violated defendant's constitutional rights to confrontation, to present defense, and to fair trial; whether trial court abused its discretion by limiting defense counsel's cross-examination of victim; whether defendant satisfied his burden of proving that any error in trial court's limitation of cross-examination was harmful.</i>	
State v. Massaro	200
<i>Sale of narcotics; certification from Appellate Court; whether trial court's improper discovery sanction precluding admission of memorandum of defense's private investigator was harmless; whether any error in allowing prosecutor, during cross-examination of private investigator, to convert him into expert witness regarding general characteristics of narcotics trade was harmless.</i>	
State v. Velasquez-Mattos	817
<i>Sexual assault first degree; risk of injury to child; claim that trial court abused its discretion in admitting testimony of certain witnesses regarding victim's disclosure of defendant's sexual abuse under constancy of accusation doctrine; unpreserved claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional rights of confrontation and to present defense by preventing defense counsel from cross-examining witness regarding witness' pending charges; whether defendant was entitled to new trial on sexual assault charge on grounds that charge, which had been premised on multiple acts, was duplicitous and that duplicity was not cured by, inter alia, specific unanimity instruction; whether defense counsel's failure to object to trial court's proposed jury instructions, which omitted specific unanimity instruction on sexual assault charge, constituted implicit waiver of defendant's unpreserved claim; whether defendant was prejudiced by duplicitous sexual assault charge.</i>	
Tilsen v. Benson	758
<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to enforce, as prenuptial agreement, parties' ketubah, which is contract governing marriage under Jewish law; whether enforcement of parties' ketubah would violate establishment clause of first amendment to United States constitution; unpreserved</i>	

claim that trial court's decision not to enforce ketubah violated plaintiff's rights to free exercise of religion under first amendment; whether trial court's finding regarding plaintiff's earning capacity was clearly erroneous; whether trial court abused its discretion in ordering plaintiff to pay defendant certain percentage of future distributions in connection with plaintiff's ownership interest in real estate asset; whether trial court improperly based its alimony award on plaintiff's gross earning capacity rather than on net available income; whether trial court's alimony award was abuse of discretion in view of plaintiff's ability to pay and defendant's earning capacity.

Wells Fargo Bank, National Assn. v. Doreus (Order) 904
Young v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) 905