

## Cumulative Table of Cases

### Connecticut Appellate Reports

### Volume 174

---

Cimino v. Cimino . . . . .	1
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion to open; abuse of discretion; motion to open judgment on basis of fraud; motion to open judgment on basis of intentional misrepresentation; postjudgment discovery; collateral attack on judgment; credibility of witness; whether dissolution court committed plain error in its valuation of defendant's pension; whether plaintiff's claim regarding valuation of defendant's pension is untimely collateral attack on judgment of dissolution court; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying plaintiff's motion to open, on basis of fraud or intentional misrepresentation, with respect to issue of defendant's pension; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to open judgment, on basis of fraud, with respect to family monetary gifts.</i>	
Grovenburg v. Rustle Meadow Associates, LLC . . . . .	18
<i>Injunction; planned communities; whether trial court improperly precluded defendants from presenting evidence concerning visual buffer area called green zone; whether evidence about green zone was relevant to determination of whether defendants reasonably exercised discretionary authority over design control matters under certain provisions in planned community's declaration (§§ 10.1 [k] and 13.1 [a]) in denying plaintiff owners' proposals to erect fence around swimming pool; court's failure to make certain factual findings to properly analyze reasonableness of defendants' determination under §§ 10.1 (k) and 13.1 (a); remand for new trial; claim that court improperly set aside fines that defendants assessed against plaintiffs for unauthorized landscaping activity and alleged removal of boundary marker; claim that defendants were entitled to award of attorney's fees for portion of counterclaim; whether court improperly declared null and void special assessment that defendants had levied against plaintiffs to cover legal expenses incurred during parties' controversy.</i>	
Pires v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	121
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court improperly concluded that trial counsel did not render ineffective assistance in failing to adequately convey to trial court petitioner's desire to represent himself; whether petitioner made clear, unequivocal request for self-representation.</i>	
Reserve Realty, LLC v. BLT Reserve, LLC . . . . .	150
<i>Foreclosure; broker's lien; appeal from judgment discharging broker's lien; whether plaintiffs could establish probable cause to sustain validity of broker's lien as required by statute (§ 20-325e).</i>	
Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC . . . . .	130
<i>Breach of contract; antitrust; claim that plaintiffs could not recover brokerage fees under listing agreements because those agreements were product of illegal tying arrangement in violation of antitrust statute (§ 35-29); whether contracts conditioning sale of land on purchase of real estate brokerage services exclusively from plaintiffs constituted illegal tying arrangement; whether defendants were required to prove existence of relevant market in order to prevail on claim that seller of land had sufficient economic power to restrain competition; whether defendants demonstrated that substantial volume of commerce in tied product was restrained.</i>	
Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC . . . . .	153
<i>Foreclosure; broker's lien; appeal from judgment discharging broker's lien; whether plaintiffs could establish probable cause to sustain validity of broker's lien as required by statute (§ 20-325e).</i>	
Rogers v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	120
<i>Habeas corpus; due process; effective assistance of counsel; claim that habeas court erred in concluding that state did not violate petitioner's right to due process when it withheld third-party culpability evidence from defense in criminal trial; claim that habeas court erred in concluding that petitioner was not denied effective assistance of counsel.</i>	
State v. Ellis . . . . .	14
<i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court improperly dismissed motion to correct; whether sentencing court violated defendant's federal constitutional</i>	

*right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment pursuant to Miller v. Alabama (567 U.S. 460); claim that trial court should hold new sentencing hearing to determine parole eligibility pursuant to 2015 Public Act (P.A. 15-84) providing that certain juvenile offenders shall be eligible for parole.*

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Owen . . . . .	102
<i>Foreclosure; motion for default for failure to plead; whether trial court abused discretion in denying motion to open strict foreclosure judgment pursuant to statute (§ 49-15); whether defendants had good cause to open strict foreclosure judgment.</i>	