

Cumulative Table of Cases
Connecticut Reports
Volume 345

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Adams v. Aircraft Spruce & Specialty Co.	312
<i>Product liability; personal jurisdiction; whether trial court properly granted named defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction; Ford Motor Co. v. Montana Eighth Judicial District Court (141 S. Ct. 1017), and Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Superior Court (137 S. Ct. 1773), discussed; whether trial court correctly concluded that exercise of specific personal jurisdiction over named defendant, California corporation, would violate due process; whether named defendant purposely availed itself of privilege of conducting business in Connecticut; whether plaintiffs established that their product liability claim arose out of or related to named defendant's forum contacts.</i>	
Adams v. Aircraft Spruce & Specialty Co. (Order)	970
A. W. v. L. R. (Order)	901
Ayuso v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	967
Bank of America, N.A. v. Maryanski (Order)	915
Bank of New York Mellon v. Fisher (Order)	915
Bank of New York Mellon v. Tope	662
<i>Foreclosure; motion to open and vacate judgment; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that named defendant's motion to open and vacate judgment of foreclosure by sale constituted collateral attack on prior judgment; claim that trial court improperly denied named defendant's motion to open and vacate judgment of foreclosure on ground that plaintiff bank lacked standing and court therefore lacked subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiff bank was holder of note or otherwise entitled to enforce it.</i>	
Barclays Bank Delaware v. Bamford (Order)	905
Bialik v. Bialik (Order)	965
Board of Education v. Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities (Order)	901
Boria v. Commissioner of Correction	39
<i>Habeas corpus; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court improperly upheld habeas court's judgment dismissing successive habeas petition; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed petition, on court's own motion, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-29), without first providing petitioner with prior notice and opportunity to be heard; decision in companion case, Brown v. Commissioner of Correction (345 Conn. 1), dispositive of issue presented.</i>	
Bradley v. Riverview-Newton Assn. (Order)	903
Brown v. Commissioner of Correction	1
<i>Habeas corpus; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly dismissed petitioner's appeal from judgment of habeas court, which dismissed petitioner's successive habeas petition; whether applicable rule of practice (§ 23-29) required habeas court to provide petitioner with prior notice and opportunity to be heard before dismissing petition on its own motion; need for remand to determine, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-24), whether writ should issue.</i>	
Camerota v. Camerota (Order)	961
Canner v. Governor's Ridge Assn., Inc. (Order)	907
Capital for Change, Inc. v. Board of Assessment Appeals (Order)	968
Cohen v. Dept. of Energy & Environmental Protection (Orders)	968, 969
Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities v. Valentin (Order)	962
Costas v. Commissioner of Revenue Services (Order)	911
Crenshaw v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	966
DAB Three, LLC v. Fitzpatrick (Order)	971
Deutsche Bank AG v. Vik (Order)	964
Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	967

Disciplinary Counsel <i>v.</i> Spadoni (Order)	921
Dowling <i>v.</i> Heirs of Bond	119
<i>Quiet title; statutory (§ 47-33j) slander of title claim; adverse possession; Marketable Title Act (§ 47-33b et seq.); whether trial court improperly required plaintiff to establish, as threshold matter in proving adverse possession claim, that she repudiated her right by deed to pass over parcel in order for her possession of parcel to become hostile; whether repudiation doctrine was applicable when right to use land for particular purpose was conferred by deed, and claimant had used land for some other purpose that was more extensive than right conferred by deed; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that plaintiff had failed to establish elements of adverse possession; whether element of adverse possession that claimant use land “under a claim of right” required showing of claimant’s subjective intent to use parcel as owner; whether trial court’s conclusion that plaintiff failed to establish elements of adverse possession was so inextricably intertwined with its incorrect application of repudiation doctrine that it could not stand as independent ground for affirmance; whether evidence supported plaintiff’s adverse possession claim; claim that trial court improperly found for defendant on its slander of title claim; whether plaintiff acted with malice, for purposes of slander of title claim, when she filed notice of claim under incorrect legal theory regarding elements of adverse possession in Connecticut that was not unreasonable.</i>	
D2E Holdings, LLC <i>v.</i> Corp. for Urban Home Ownership of New Haven (Order)	904
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. <i>v.</i> Speer (Orders)	906, 907
Epright <i>v.</i> Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. (Order)	908
Fain <i>v.</i> Benak (Order)	912
Fieldhouse <i>v.</i> Regency Coachworks, Inc. (Order)	906
Fischer <i>v.</i> Lawyers Title Corp. (Order) (See DAB Three, LLC <i>v.</i> Fitzpatrick)	971
Ferri <i>v.</i> Powell-Ferri (Order)	911
Ghio <i>v.</i> Liberty Ins. Underwriters, Inc. (Order)	909
Gianetti <i>v.</i> Neigher (Order)	963
GMAT Legal Title Trust 2014-1, U.S. Bank National Assn. <i>v.</i> Catale (Order)	905
Grant <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction	683
<i>s corpus; claim that habeas court improperly denied habeas petition; whether habeas court incorrectly determined that petitioner’s sixth amendment right to autonomy in deciding fundamental objectives of his defense, as recognized in McCoy v. Louisiana (138 S. Ct. 1500), was inapplicable to present case, in which petitioner’s trial counsel conceded at criminal trial that petitioner had acted recklessly and was guilty of manslaughter; reviewability of petitioner’s unpreserved claim that petitioner’s trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to adequately explain to jury relationship between recklessness and self-defense.</i>	
Harrigan <i>v.</i> Fidelity National Title Ins. Co. (Order)	964
Hassett <i>v.</i> Secor’s Auto Center, Inc. (Order)	965
Highland Street Associates <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Transportation (Order)	917
Idlibi <i>v.</i> Connecticut State Dental Commission (Order)	904
Inglis <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Order)	917
In re Anaishaly C. (Order)	914
In re Aubrey K. (Order)	972
In re Delilah G. (Order)	911
In re Edgar S. (Order)	972
In re Faith D.-A. (Order)	960
In re Katia V. (Order)	913
In re Lil’Patrick T. (Order)	962
In re Lillyanne D. (Order)	913
In re Omar I. (Order)	913
In re Police Case Numbers: Meriden PD 20-003903, 20-005055 & Berlin PD 2020-11662 (Order)	964
In re Probate Appeal of Harris (Order)	918
In re Takie O. (Order)	922
Jaynes <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Order)	972
Kazemi <i>v.</i> Allen (Order)	971
Konover Development Corp. <i>v.</i> Waterbury Omega, LLC (Order)	919
Levco Tech, Inc. <i>v.</i> Kelly (Order)	918
Li <i>v.</i> Yaggi (Order)	904
Marcial S. <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Order)	966
Maye <i>v.</i> Canady (Order)	919

Mercedes-Benz Financial v. 1188 Stratford Ave., LLC (Order)	910
Milford v. Recycling, Inc. (Order)	906
Morquecho v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	970
New Milford v. Standard Demolition Services, Inc. (Order)	908
Olson v. Olson (Order)	918
Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC v. Maryanski (Order)	914
Puteri v. Governor's Ridge Assn., Inc. (Order)	907
Rek v. Pettit (Order)	969
Rosa v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	916
Rosa v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	973
Russbach v. Yanez-Ventura (Order)	902
Santiago v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	903
Savings Institute Bank & Trust Co. v. Rabon (Order)	915
Seramonte Associates, LLC v. Hamden	76
<i>Tax appeal; imposition of tax penalty pursuant to statute (§ 12-63c (d)) for plaintiff's alleged failure to timely submit certain income and expense information required by defendant town's assessor; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that word "submit," as used in § 12-63c (a), unambiguously required that income and expense information be received by, rather than mailed to, assessor by June 1.</i>	
Simms v. Zucco (Order)	919
Smith v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	921
Solon v. Slater	794
<i>Tortious interference with contractual relations; tortious interference with right of inheritance; collateral estoppel; res judicata; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that plaintiff was collaterally estopped from litigating claims for tortious interference with contractual relations and right of inheritance in trial court notwithstanding prior Probate Court proceedings, in which decedent's will was admitted to probate over plaintiff's undue influence and testamentary capacity objections; whether Probate Court, in considering plaintiff's undue influence objection to admission of will to probate, actually and necessarily determined that defendants tortiously interfered with contractual relations relating to decedent's proposed amendments to his and plaintiff's antenuptial agreement; claim that Appellate Court's judgment could be affirmed on alternative ground that tortious interference with contractual relations claim was barred by doctrine of res judicata; whether plaintiff lacked adequate opportunity to litigate tortious interference with contractual relations claim in Probate Court.</i>	
Speer v. New London Property Group Trust (Order)	909
State v. Ares	290
<i>Arson first degree; reckless endangerment first degree; risk of injury to child; claim that evidence was insufficient to support conviction of risk of injury to child under act prong of risk of injury statute (§ 53-21 (a) (1)); claim that act prong of § 53-21 (a) (1) was unconstitutionally vague as applied to defendant; whether state failed to prove that defendant had perpetrated act directly on child; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to notice of charges against him by finding him guilty under situation prong, rather than act prong, of § 53-21 (a) (1) when state's information alleged only that defendant violated act prong of that subdivision.</i>	
State v. Brandon	702
<i>Manslaughter first degree with firearm; motion to suppress; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant's motion to suppress statements he had made during recorded police interviews; whether defendant was in custody for purposes of Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436), when police interviewed defendant in secured area of probation office, at conclusion of defendant's regularly scheduled meeting with his probation officer; whether trial court properly denied defendant's motion to suppress statements that he had made during recorded interrogation by police at police station.</i>	
State v. Brown	354
<i>Felony murder; carrying pistol or revolver without permit; whether evidence was sufficient to support defendant's conviction of felony murder, predicated on felony offense of third degree robbery; whether there was insufficient evidence to support conclusion that defendant had committed larceny; claim that evidence was insufficient to establish that defendant had used or threatened immediate use of physical force for purpose of preventing or overcoming resistance to taking of</i>	

	<i>property or retention thereof immediately after taking, or compelling owner of property to deliver up property; claim that defendant was deprived of his due process right to fair trial when prosecutor engaged in prosecutorial improprieties during closing arguments by arguing facts that were not in evidence and making inferences that were unsupported by evidence.</i>	
State v. Douglas C.		421
	<i>Risk of injury to child; jury unanimity; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that defendant's constitutional right to unanimous jury verdict was not violated because none of risk of injury counts at issue charged defendant with violating multiple statutory provisions, subsections or clauses of risk of injury statute (§ 53-21 (a) (2)); whether defendant's right to jury unanimity was violated on ground that counts of information were duplicitous insofar as they charged defendant with single violation of § 53-21 (a) (2) when there was evidence of multiple, separate distinct incidents of misconduct; multipart test for claims of unanimity as to instances of conduct to determine whether defendant's constitutional right to jury unanimity was violated by trial court's failure to give specific unanimity instruction, discussed.</i>	
State v. Gamer (Order)		920
State v. Garrison (Order)		959
State v. Gary S.		387
	<i>Sexual assault first degree; attempt to commit sexual assault first degree; sexual assault second degree; risk of injury to child; claim that evidence was insufficient to support conviction of certain count of risk of injury to child; claim that evidence was insufficient to support conviction of three counts of second degree sexual assault; whether evidence was sufficient to establish that defendant was victim's "guardian or otherwise responsible for the general supervision of [victim's] welfare" at time of sexual assaults, for purposes of second degree sexual assault statute (§ 53a-71 (a) (4)); claim that prosecutor made improper remarks during closing and rebuttal arguments, in violation of defendant's due process right to fair trial.</i>	
State v. Ghant (Order)		901
State v. Gonzalez (Order)		967
State v. Greer (Order)		916
State v. James A.		599
	<i>Sexual assault first degree; sexual assault second degree; risk of injury to child; strangulation first degree; threatening second degree; disorderly conduct; procedures to be followed by trial court in determining whether joinder is proper, discussed; claim that trial court abused its discretion by joining defendant's sexual assault cases and threatening and disorderly conduct cases for trial; claim that, for evidence to be cross admissible for joinder purposes, all evidence from each case must be fully admissible in every other case; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that evidence of conduct that gave rise to charges in threatening and disorderly conduct cases was admissible in sexual assault cases; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that evidence of conduct that gave rise to charges in sexual assault cases was admissible in threatening and disorderly conduct cases; whether record was adequate to review claim that trial court improperly had denied defendant's request, as remedy for witness' improper disclosure of defendant's prior felony convictions, to testify about nonsexual nature of those convictions without being subject to cross-examination regarding specific nature of those convictions.</i>	
State v. Johnson		174
	<i>Sexual assault first degree; unlawful restraint first degree; assault second degree; persistent dangerous felony offender; claim that defendant's federal constitutional right to confrontation was violated by virtue of admission of testimony by employees of state forensic laboratory relating to numerical DNA profiles generated by another analyst or other analysts; whether defendant waived his confrontation clause claim; whether DNA analyst's testimony violated defendant's confrontation rights on ground that analyst was not involved in generating and had no personal knowledge of certain DNA profiles used in comparisons about which she testified; whether improper admission of forensic biologist's testimony about certain forensic reports was harmful; whether trial court correctly concluded that defendant's due process rights were not violated when state failed to correct certain, allegedly false or misleading trial testimony regarding pretrial meeting between prosecutor and complainant; claim that prosecutor's disclosures to defense counsel and to</i>	

trial court regarding pretrial meeting were sufficient to satisfy due process; claim that use of term “victim” by prosecutor and certain witnesses to refer to complainants violated defendant’s right to fair trial.

State v. Joseph V. 516
Sexual assault first degree; risk of injury to child; conspiracy to commit risk of injury to child; jury unanimity; certification from Appellate Court; claim that defendant’s constitutional right to jury unanimity was violated on ground that counts of information were duplicitous insofar as each count charged defendant with single violation of applicable statute, despite evidence of multiple, separate incidents of unlawful conduct; whether defendant was prejudiced by trial court’s denial of motion for bill of particulars or request for specific unanimity instruction; whether defendant’s right to jury unanimity as to elements of crime was violated on ground that counts charging defendant with risk of injury to child and conspiracy to commit risk of injury were duplicitous.

State v. Lori T. 44
Custodial interference second degree; certification from Appellate Court; unpreserved claim that statute (§ 53a-98 (a) (3)) governing crime of custodial interference in second degree was unconstitutionally vague as applied to defendant; whether § 53a-98 (a) (3) was unconstitutionally vague as applied to defendant because it gave her no notice that her inaction in connection with her failure to have her children go with their father would satisfy “refuses to return” element of statute; claim that person of ordinary intelligence in defendant’s position would not reasonably have known that she was engaged in prohibited conduct insofar as § 53a-98 and case law are silent on precisely what action is required to return children to lawful custodian; whether § 53a-98 (a) (3) is unconstitutionally vague on ground that it is subject to arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement; whether evidence was sufficient to prove that defendant “refuse[d] to return” her children to father within meaning of § 53a-98 (a) (3) and to support defendant’s conviction.

State v. Magaraci (Order). 916
 State v. Norris (Order) 910
 State v. Ortega 220
Sexual assault first degree; attempt to commit sexual assault first degree; sexual assault fourth degree; risk of injury to child; tender years hearsay exception (§ 54-86f (a) and Conn. Code Evid. § 8-10); claim that trial court abused its discretion in admitting, under tender years exception to hearsay rule, statements of three year old victim of sexual abuse, which concerned sexual offenses committed by defendant against victim; whether victim’s statements were made under circumstances that provided particularized guarantees of trustworthiness; unpreserved claim that trial court abused its discretion in admitting translated transcription of audio recording of victim’s statements because that transcript had been modified by victim’s mother and such modifications constituted improper lay opinion testimony; whether record supported defendant’s claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying defense counsel’s request for continuance.

State v. Pan (Order). 922
 State v. Pringle (Order). 912
 State v. Russaw (Order) 902
 State v. Smith (Order). 963
 State v. Sumler (Order). 961
 State v. Sweet (Order) 920
 State v. Waters (Order). 914
 State v. Washington 258
Intentional manslaughter first degree with firearm; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; carrying pistol or revolver without permit; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court improperly admitted into evidence recordings of phone calls that defendant had made to his sister from his holding cell after his arrest on ground that recordings contained evidence of defendant’s postarrest silence, in violation of Doyle v. Ohio (426 U.S. 610); whether there was sufficient evidence presented at trial to warrant trial court’s combat by agreement instruction; whether trial court’s improper instruction on combat by agreement was harmless beyond reasonable doubt; claim that prosecutor had committed certain improprieties during portions of his closing argument, in violation of defendant’s due process right to fair trial; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly denied defendant’s motion for new trial, in which he alleged that COVID-19

pandemic had adversely affected jurors' deliberations by pressuring them to deliberate in hurried fashion, thereby depriving defendant of right to fair and impartial jury.

Szymonik v. Szymonik (Order)	962
U.S. Bank, N.A. v. Semeghini (Order)	973
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Blackman (Order)	916
U.S. Bank Trust, N.A. v. O'Brien (Order)	969
VanDeusen v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	903
Velasco v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	960
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Trevino (Order)	971