

## Cumulative Table of Cases

### Connecticut Appellate Reports

### Volume 174

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Access Agency, Inc. v. Second Consolidated Blimpie Connecticut Realty, Inc. . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 218 |
| <i>Contracts; landlord and tenant; whether trial court's findings that 2000 lease agreement had expired and that defendant was not guarantor of new lease executed in 2010 were clearly erroneous; whether trial court improperly used exhibit for substantive purposes rather than for limited purpose for which it had been admitted; harmless error.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |     |
| American Express Bank, FSB v. Rutkowski . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 472 |
| <i>Breach of contractual credit agreement; whether trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment; statute of frauds (§ 52-550 [a] [6]); whether credit card agreement constituted loan exceeding \$50,000 for purposes of statute of frauds.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |     |
| Avery v. Medina . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 507 |
| <i>Injunction; motion for contempt; claim that trial court, in granting motion for contempt, impermissibly modified substantive terms of judgment by converting mandatory injunction into prohibitive injunction that forbade any structure from being constructed in setback, not just permanent structure prohibited by language of restrictive covenant; whether judgment in prior appeal and order of trial court requiring defendants to remove all portions of stone wall within setback were ambiguous; claim that contempt finding deprived defendants of fundamental property right; reviewability of claim that trial court abused discretion by awarding plaintiffs \$1500 in attorney's fees.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |     |
| Bank of America, National Assn. v. Nino (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 901 |
| Bank of America, N.A., Trustee v. Chainani . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 476 |
| <i>Mortgage foreclosure; rule of practice (§ 23-18 [a]) permitting proof of amount of mortgage debt by admission of affidavit of debt; standard of review to apply in § 23-18 (a) claims; claim that trial court erred in admitting affidavit into evidence under § 23-18 (a) when defendant disputed amount of debt; whether denial of default and averred insufficient knowledge to admit or deny amount of debt were sufficient to bar affidavit's admission under § 23-18 (a).</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |     |
| Bank of New York Mellon v. Talbot . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 377 |
| <i>Foreclosure; whether trial court abused discretion in granting second motion for judgment of strict foreclosure; whether, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 17-20 [d]), default for failure to appear was automatically set aside by operation of law when counsel filed appearance; claim that default for failure to plead was void ab initio because it was entered after first foreclosure motion had been granted erroneously and was, thus, predicated on invalid entry of default; whether second foreclosure judgment was predicated on valid entry of default for failure to plead; whether first foreclosure judgment, which was void initio, had any legal effect or bearing on validity of subsequent default for failure to plead; whether, pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 17-32 [b]), default for failure to plead was not automatically set aside and trial court had discretion to deny motion to set aside default where defendant filed answer after plaintiff filed motion for judgment of strict foreclosure.</i> |     |
| 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>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |     |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Crouse v. Cox . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 343 |
| <i>Fraud; motion to dismiss.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |     |
| Crouse v. Sloat (Memorandum Decision) . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 901 |
| EH Investment Co., LLC v. Chappo LLC . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 344 |
| <i>Breach of contract; whether lease renewal with lessee was condition precedent to plaintiff lessor's contract with defendants to find lender willing to make commercial loan; claim that trial court improperly construed contract as including condition precedent that required defendants to return plaintiff's deposit; whether trial court gave proper deference to language of fully integrated contract; whether parties to contract failed to fully contemplate occurrence or nonoccurrence of lease extension; whether trial court properly shifted risk from plaintiff to defendants.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |     |
| Godaire v. Dept. of Social Services . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 385 |
| <i>Administrative appeal; appeal from judgment of trial court dismissing administrative appeal from decision of Department of Social Services discontinuing plaintiff's medical benefits; claim that plaintiff was denied access to court due to change of venue; whether court properly determined that there was authority for transfer of case to different judicial district pursuant to statute (§ 51-347b [a]); whether, under circumstances of case, hearing officer's decision was made upon unlawful procedure where plaintiff did not have meaningful opportunity to respond to corrected evidence presented by department; whether substantial rights of plaintiff were prejudiced; whether plaintiff, who had been informed by department that eligibility period had been extended, detrimentally relied on such information to meet corrected deadline for obtaining and presenting bill for dental work; whether plaintiff's preexisting eligibility through February, 2015, was required under doctrine of equitable tolling.</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> |     |
| Healey v. Haymond Law Firm, P.C. . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 230 |
| <i>Unpaid wages; induced error; jury instructions; plain error doctrine; entitlement to double damages and attorney's fees pursuant to statute (§ 31-72); claim that trial court should have instructed jury on repealed version of § 31-72, pursuant to which plaintiff may recover double damages if plaintiff proved that defendant withheld wages in bad faith, instead of instructing jury that, pursuant to amended version of § 31-72, it must award plaintiff double damages for unlawfully withheld wages unless defendant establishes that it withheld wages in good faith; whether defendant induced alleged instructional error of which it complained by affirmatively requesting language it challenged on appeal; claim that trial court's alleged error in determining that amended version of § 31-72 applied retroactively was plain error.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |     |
| Johnson v. Preleski . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 285 |
| <i>Petition for new trial; statute of limitations; whether trial court properly dismissed petition as untimely; claim that action was timely pursuant to saving statute (§ 52-593a), which requires that process be personally delivered to marshal within limitation period, where there was evidence that fax of process was transmitted to marshal within limitation period, but no evidence as to when marshal came into physical possession of process to be served.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |     |
| Kurisoo v. Ziegler . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 462 |
| <i>Negligence; action for personal injuries sustained in motor vehicle accident; duty of care; reasonably foreseeable risk; vicarious liability; motion for summary judgment; whether court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of defendant company on both of its motions because court based its rulings on ground not raised in defendant's summary judgment motions; claim that defend-</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |     |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <i>ant company did not owe duty of care to plaintiff because defendant's alleged negligence did not create reasonably foreseeable risk that alleged harm would occur, as required under first prong of legal duty analysis; claim that vicarious liability could not be established because defendant driver was not acting as agent, servant or employee of defendant company at time of collision that caused plaintiff's injuries.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |     |
| Marra v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 440 |
| <i>Habeas corpus; withdrawal of action; deliberate bypass doctrine; claim that trial court improperly gave preclusive effect to ruling of prior habeas court that petitioner's withdrawal was with prejudice when no hearing on merits had commenced; claim that trial court improperly concluded that doctrine of deliberate bypass barred petitioner's habeas action; whether court's determination that habeas action withdrawn with prejudice implicated court's subject matter jurisdiction.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                 |     |
| Pajor v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 157 |
| <i>Unemployment compensation; motion to correct; claim that appeals referee improperly dismissed plaintiff's appeal for failure to attend hearing on remand from prior appeal to Employment Security Board of Review; claim that board improperly refused to grant motion to correct seeking to correct its findings with respect to Polish language proficiency of plaintiff's attorney and whether plaintiff had misunderstood counsel's instruction regarding hearing; whether board was required to admit as true certain facts that plaintiff claimed were undisputed and material to subsequent appeal; whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's appeal.</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>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |     |
| Pronovost v. Tierney . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 368 |
| <i>Negligence; personal jurisdiction; whether long arm statute (§ 52-59b [a] [3] [B]), which confers personal jurisdiction over nonresident individual with respect to cause of action arising from tortious act outside Connecticut that causes injury to person or property in Connecticut, provided jurisdiction over defendant; whether, in order to confer jurisdiction over defendant, § 52-59b (a) (3) (B) required that substantial revenue be derived from Connecticut.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                  |     |
| Redding Life Care, LLC v. Redding . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 193 |
| <i>Writ of error; claim that trial court improperly denied plaintiff in error's motion for protective order seeking to prohibit deposition by defendant in error; whether Connecticut law prohibits compelling unretained expert testimony; whether absolute unretained expert privilege or qualified privilege that can be overcome by demonstrating compelling need existed under Connecticut law.</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;</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |     |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <i>claim that habeas court erred in concluding that petitioner was not denied effective assistance of counsel.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |     |
| Santos v. Zoning Board of Appeals . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 531 |
| <i>Inverse condemnation; unjust enrichment; whether trial court properly determined that plaintiff failed to prove claim for inverse condemnation; whether plaintiff demonstrated that he had reasonable investment-backed expectation of use of property that was thwarted by defendants' regulations; claim that defendant town had been unjustly enriched by preventing plaintiff from developing property.</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 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.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |     |
| State v. Gansel . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 525 |
| <i>Larceny in first degree; embezzlement; claim that trial court abused discretion by admitting inculpatory e-mails into evidence; whether admission of e-mails was harmful; whether e-mails were cumulative of other properly admitted evidence that independently provided basis for conviction.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |     |
| State v. Holley . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 488 |
| <i>Possession of narcotics with intent to sell by person who is not drug-dependent; mootness; claim that trial court's jury instruction concerning reasonable doubt diluted state's burden of proof; whether there was reasonable possibility that jury was misled by discrepancy between court's oral and written instructions regarding state's burden of proof; whether claim challenging denial of motion to suppress was moot where defendant failed to challenge independent basis that supported decision denying motion to suppress.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |     |
| State v. Joseph . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 260 |
| <i>Sexual assault first degree; risk of injury to child; whether trial court violated defendant's statutory (§ 54-82m) right to speedy trial; reviewability of claim that court violated defendant's sixth amendment right to speedy trial; unpreserved claim that court denied defendant's right to procedural due process by failing to hold hearings on pro se motions for speedy trial; waiver of claim that court improperly instructed jury about constancy of accusation testimony; whether court committed plain error when it instructed jury about constancy of accusation evidence.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                             |     |
| State v. Patel . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 298 |
| <i>Petition for review; whether trial court improperly precluded petitioner from copying certain trial exhibits in custody of clerk's office; claim that court's orders that referenced sealing of documents and limited access to trial exhibits in custody of clerk's office were issued pursuant to rule of practice (§ 1-11C) applicable to media coverage of criminal proceedings; claim that orders that referenced sealing of documents and limited access to trial exhibits in custody of clerk's office were final and could not be challenged in petition for review; claim that court's orders that referenced sealing of documents and limited access to trial exhibits in custody of clerk's office were not subject to expedited review pursuant to statute (§ 51-164x [c]).</i> |     |
| State v. Purcell . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 401 |
| <i>Risk of injury to child; whether trial court abused discretion in denying defendant's motion for mistrial; claim that jury verdict was substantially swayed by testimony that victim had been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder; claim that harmfulness of testimony that victim had been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder could not be cured by court's instruction to jury; whether court improperly denied defendant's motion to suppress statements to police made during custodial interrogation; unpreserved claim that article first, § 8, of state constitution required police to cease questioning during custodial interrogation and to clarify defendant's ambiguous or equivocal references to counsel.</i>                                           |     |
| State v. Reddick . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 536 |
| <i>Assault in first degree; criminal possession of firearm; assault in third degree; claim that defendant's constitutional right to fair trial was violated when prosecutor stated to jury that defendant did not inform police that he acted in self-defense; claim that defendant was deprived of right to fair trial when prosecutor expressed opinion about witness' credibility and appealed to jurors' emotions.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |     |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| State v. Smith . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 172 |
| <i>Sexual assault second degree; risk of injury to child; claim that defendant's conviction violated his right to due process under Connecticut constitution because police lost potentially exculpatory evidence; whether record adequate to review defendant's claim pursuant to State v. Golding (213 Conn. 233) with respect to allegedly exculpatory evidence; claim that defendant's constitutional right against double jeopardy was violated by conviction of sexual assault second degree and risk of injury to child; whether defendant demonstrated that subject crimes constituted same offense for double jeopardy purposes under test set forth in Blockburger v. United States (284 U.S. 299).</i> |     |
| Valley National Bank v. Marciano . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 206 |
| <i>Breach of contract; personal guarantee of line of credit; action to enforce debt owed by defendant as personal guarantor on line of credit; claim that plaintiff did not establish standing and proper chain of title regarding ownership of promissory note originally executed and personally guaranteed by defendant to other entity; claim that plaintiff submitted insufficient evidence to accurately establish loan balance claimed owed by defendant.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |     |
| Ventres v. Cais (Memorandum Decision). . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 901 |
| 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>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |     |
| Williams Ground Services, Inc. v. Jordan. . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 247 |
| <i>Action for payment due for services rendered; whether trial court's finding that statute of limitations had been tolled by defendant's several acknowledgments of debt was clearly erroneous; whether claims concerning credibility of witnesses and weight of evidence were matters for trial court as trier of fact; claim that trial court abused discretion in admitting into evidence photocopies of invoices of defendant's monthly bills; claim that photocopies were not complete and accurate copies of originals sufficient to satisfy § 8-4 (c) of Connecticut Code of Evidence; whether plaintiff sought to admit reproductions of business records or original business records.</i>              |     |