## Cumulative Table of Cases Connecticut Appellate Reports Volume 174

## (Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Access Agency, Inc. v. Second Consolidated Blimpie Connecticut Realty, Inc 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 experience.	218
admitted; harmless error.	472
American Express Bank, FSB v. Rutkowski	412
of frauds.	
Avery v. Medina	507
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 discre-	
tion by awarding plaintiffs \$1500 in attorney's fees.	
Bank of America, National Assn. v. Nino (Memorandum Decision)	901
Bank of America, N.A., Trustee v. Chainani	476
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).	
Bank of New York Mellon v. Talbot	377
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.	
Cathedral Green, Inc. v. Hughes	608
Summary process; noncompliance with stipulated judgment; order of execution; claim that trial court improperly relied on facts not in evidence and not supported	
by record; claim that trial court failed to properly adjudicate defendant's equitable	
nonforfeiture defense.	1
Cimino v. Cimino	1
ment on basis of fraud; motion to open; abuse of discretion; 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.  Clinton S. v. Commissioner of Correction	821
Crouse v. Cox	343
Fraud; motion to dismiss.	901
Crouse v. Sloat (Memorandum Decision)  Deutsche Bank AG v. Sebastian Holdings, Inc.  Enforcement of foreign judgment; claim seeking to pierce corporate veil; summary judgment; res judicata; collateral estoppel; claim that trial court improperly denied defendants' motion for summary judgment because plaintiff's corporate veil piercing claim arose out of same series of transactions as foreign action and should have been raised in that action; whether plaintiff's claim was barred by doctrine of res judicata; claim that trial court improperly denied plaintiff's motion for summary judgment because issue of whether individual defendant was alter ego of corporate defendant previously had been decided in foreign action; whether doctrine of collateral estoppel precluded defendants from relitigating alter ego issue in trial court; whether facts relevant to issues in foreign action and those in present action were identical for purposes of issue preclusion.	573
Diaz $v$ . Commissioner of Correction	776
Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner's right to due process and fair trial were violated by prosecutor's failure to disclose material evidence that was favorable to defense; claim that counsel in prior habeas proceeding rendered ineffective assistance because they failed to identify, understand, research, raise, or argue that petitioner's rights to due process and fair trial were violated by prosecutor's failure to disclose material evidence that was favorable to defense.	
EH Investment Co., LLC v. Chappo LLC	344
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.	
Freeman v. A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc.	649
Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.); (§ 42-110b-28 [b] [1]) of state regulations; fraudulent misrepresentation; whether trial court erred as matter of law in concluding that defendant violated CUTPA; criteria pursuant to federal cigarette rule for determining whether trade practice is unfair, set forth and discussed; whether trial court erred as matter of law in concluding that defendant committed fraudulent misrepresentation by nondisclosure of material facts; whether trial court erred as matter of law in awarding punitive damages and attorney's fees.	
Godaire v. Dept. of Social Services	385
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.	
Grovenburg v. Rustle Meadow Associates, LLC	18
Healey v. Haymond Law Firm, P.C	230
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.	
Johnson v. Preleski	285
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.	
Kurisoo v. Ziegler	462
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 defendant 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.	
Lederle v. Spivey	592
ney's fees pursuant to bad faith exception to general rule that attorney's fees are not allowed to successful party in absence of contractual or statutory exception; whether, in order to impose sanctions under bad faith exception pursuant to inherent authority, trial court must find both that litigant's claims were entirely without color and that litigant acted in bad faith; whether trial court's findings concerning bad faith exception must be supported with high degree of specificity; whether trial court failed to apply proper standard in awarding attorney's fees when court failed to delineate finding that defendant's prior appeal lacked any indicia of colorable claim with clear evidence and high degree of specificity; whether record demonstrated that trial court applied correct standard for colorability applicable to party, as opposed to attorney, and that it thus considered whether defendant's principal claim in previous appeal was so lacking in factual and legal support that reasonable person could not have concluded that basis of claim might be established.	

Mahoney v. Storch Smith.  Medical malpractice; motion to set aside verdict and for new trial; claim that defendants' use of video violated expert disclosure rules under rule of practice (§ 13-4), because video and related testimony from defendants' expert, were not disclosed pursuant to that provision; claim that video, and testimony of defendants' expert concerning it, were irrelevant, unduly cumulative, prejudicial and confusing to jury; claim that trial court improperly denied plaintiffs' motion to set aside verdict and for new trial in light of fact that trial court did not instruct jury that video was for demonstrative purposes only; claim that trial court abused its discretion by allegedly discouraging jury from rehearing expert medical testimony during jury's deliberations.  Maluccio v. Zoning Board of Appeals.	639 750
Zoning appeal; whether decision of defendant zoning board of appeals was illegal and not supported by record; claim that trial court improperly found that recreation area designation on subdivision map created only private right or restriction unenforceable by zoning law; whether subdivision regulations required developer to designate property as recreation area; whether planning commission had required recreation area when approving subdivision; claim that trial court erred in determining that town was required to accept title to property to effectuate recreation area designation.	
Marra v. Commissioner of Correction	440
Pajor v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act	157
Pires v. Commissioner of Correction	121
Pronovost v. Tierney	368
Redding Life Care, LLC v. Redding .  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.	193
Reserve Realty, LLC v. BLT Reserve, LLC	150
Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC.  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	130

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.	
Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC	153
Reyes v. Medina Loveras, LLC	804
Ring v. Litchfield Bancorp	813
Rogers v. Commissioner of Correction	120
Santander Bank, N.A. v. Godek	748
Foreclosure; foreclosure by sale; whether trial court committed reversible error.  Santos v. Zoning Board of Appeals	531
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.	
State v. Carter	749
State v. Ellis	14
State v. Gansel	525
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.	
State v. Holley	488
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.	
State v. Joseph	260
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.	
State v. O'Donnell	675
Bribery of witness; tampering with witness; whether evidence was sufficient to	010
support conviction of bribery of witness; whether evidence was insufficient to prove charge of tampering with witness; reviewability of claim that "one-witness-plus-corroboration" rule applicable to perjury prosecutions should apply to conviction of tampering with witness; claim that trial court abused discretion in denying motion to set aside verdict; claim that court improperly failed to give	
jury instruction regarding "one-witness-plus-corroboration" rule; claim that court erred when it refused request that witness testify in proffer outside jury's presence and permitted witness to invoke fifth amendment privilege in front of jury; whether court abused discretion in granting motion to quash subpoena for information related to witness protection program.	
State v. Patel	298
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]).	
State v. Purcell	401
Risk of injury to child; whether trial court abused discretion in denying defendant's	101
motion for mistrial; claim that fury 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.	
State v. Reddick	536
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.	
State v. Sampson	624
Interfering with officer; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to confrontation by granting motion in limine to exclude certain evidence; whether excluded evidence related to ability or propensity of witness to tell truth; whether constitutional claim necessarily failed where trial court properly determined that evidence was not relevant; whether trial court abused discretion by finding inadmissible certain testimony; whether excluded testimony related to collateral issue that was not directly relevant to elements of crime charged, tended to prove or to disprove any element of charged offense, or was relevant to issue of reasonableness of use of force by police officer; whether defendant's right to present defense was violated.	
State v. Smith	172
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 (28h U.S. 200)	

State v. Young	760
Assault in first degree; carrying pistol without permit; sufficiency of evidence; supplemental jury instruction; claim that there was insufficient evidence to support conviction of assault in first degree; claim that trial court abused discretion by admitting into evidence names of defendant's prior felony convictions; whether probability whose of wideren of with felony to probability the supplementary of	
whether probative value of evidence of prior felony convictions outweighed its prejudicial effect; claim that court abused discretion by giving supplemental charge to jury in which it named prior felony convictions.	
Stones Trail, LLC v. Weston	715
Inverse condemnation; ripeness; violation of constitutional rights; whether trial court improperly set aside jury verdict; whether court improperly dismissed action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that finality of judgments doctrine barred court from reconsidering whether it had subject matter jurisdiction; claim that law of case doctrine barred court from revisiting issue of ripeness;	
whether court properly determined that plaintiff did not have vested rights in its configuration of real property; claim that court improperly relied on prior decision of this court in determining that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction; whether court improperly rejected claim that it would have been futile to seek subdivision approval; claim that ripeness review did not apply to claims of	
violation of certain constitutional rights; claim that court materially changed its initial decision when it filed revised memorandum of decision.	200
Valley National Bank v. Marcano	206
Ventres $v$ . Cais (Memorandum Decision)	901
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Owen	102
(§ 49-15); whether defendants had good cause to open strict foreclosure judgment.	0.45
Williams Ground Services, Inc. v. Jordan.	247
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.	