

Cumulative Table of Cases

Connecticut Reports

Volume 330

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Akers v. University of Connecticut Law School (Order)	902
Amelio v. Monthie (Orders)	907
Angersola v. Radiologic Associates of Middletown, P.C.	251
<i>Wrongful death action pursuant to statute (§ 52-555); motions to dismiss plaintiffs' action on ground that plaintiffs failed to commence action within five year repose period set forth in § 52-555; motion for limited discovery of disputed facts related to trial court's jurisdiction; claim that repose period of § 52-555 had been tolled as to all defendants in accordance with continuing course of conduct and continuing course of treatment doctrines; whether trial court correctly determined that failure to comply with repose provision of § 52-555 deprives trial court of subject matter jurisdiction over action brought pursuant to that statute; claim that plaintiffs could not invoke continuing course of conduct and continuing course of treatment doctrines as basis for extending repose period set forth in § 52-555; whether plaintiffs properly preserved their claim for evidentiary hearing to address disputed issues of fact in support of their tolling claims; whether trial court correctly concluded that record did not support application of continuing course of treatment doctrine; whether trial court properly denied plaintiffs' request for limited discovery or for evidentiary hearing before it ruled on motions to dismiss, in order to resolve disputed jurisdictional facts related to claim that repose period of § 52-555 was tolled by continuing course of conduct doctrine.</i>	
Battistotti v. Suzanne A. (Order)	904
Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC v. Park City Sports, LLC (Order).	901
Bennett v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	910
Clements v. Aramark Corp. (Order).	904
Desmond v. Yale-New Haven Hospital, Inc. (Order)	902
Dish Network, LLC v. Commissioner of Revenue Services	280
<i>Tax appeal; claim that plaintiff satellite video company's failure to request administrative review of audit pursuant to statute (§ 12-268i) barred subsequent request for refund pertaining to same tax period; whether trial court correctly concluded that gross earnings from sale, lease, installation, and maintenance of equipment were taxable pursuant to statute (§ 12-256 [b] [2]); whether trial court correctly concluded that gross earnings from digital video recording services and payment related fees were not taxable pursuant to § 12-256 (b) (2); whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiff was not entitled to interest on refund pursuant to statute (§ 12-268c [b] [1]).</i>	
Filosi v. Electric Boat Corp.	231
<i>Workers' compensation; collateral estoppel; claim for benefits under state Workers' Compensation Act (§ 31-275 et seq.) by plaintiff, who had been awarded benefits under federal Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. § 901 et seq.) following husband's death from lung cancer that allegedly was caused by workplace asbestos exposure; whether finding by administrative law judge in prior federal proceeding that decedent's workplace exposure to asbestos was substantial contributing cause of development of his lung cancer precluded defendant employer and defendant insurers from contesting issue of causation under state act; claim by defendants that they were not collaterally estopped from litigating causal connection between decedent's death and his workplace exposure to asbestos because federal act requires lower standard of causation than substantial factor standard required under state act.</i>	
Francis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order).	903
Georges v. OB-GYN Services, P.C. (Order).	905
Greene v. Commissioner of Correction.	1
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that prosecutor's failure to correct allegedly false testimony pertaining to plea agreement for cooperating witness deprived petitioner of right to due process of law; recommendation for conducting examinations of cooperating witnesses with respect to plea agreements, discussed; claim that state violated</i>	

<i>petitioner's right to due process on ground that prosecutor knew before petitioner's criminal trial, but failed to disclose, intention to recommend favorable sentence for cooperating witness; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying petitioner's request to issue capias.</i>	
Hall v. Hall (Order)	911
Hamburg v. Hamburg (Order)	916
Hartford v. CBV Parking Hartford, LLC.	200
<i>Eminent domain; challenge to statement of compensation filed by plaintiff city; claim that city's appeal was moot because it challenged only one of two independent grounds that supported trial court's fair market value determination; whether trial court improperly valued property on basis of unreasonable assumption that defendants would assemble their parcels with adjoining properties owned by city for development; whether trial court improperly awarded interest pursuant to statute (§ 37-3c) at rate of 7.22 percent and offer of compromise interest.</i>	
Hum v. Silvester (Order)	919
In re James H. (Order) (See In re Katherine H.)	906
In re Katherine H. (Order)	906
In re Zoey H. (Order)	906
Kaplan v. Scheer (Order)	913
Ledyard v. WMS Gaming, Inc.	75
<i>Personal property taxes; attorney's fees; final judgment; appellate jurisdiction; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over defendant's appeal from trial court's decision to grant plaintiff town's motion for summary judgment as to liability only; claim that Appellate Court improperly dismissed appeal by relying on footnote in Paranteau v. DeVita (208 Conn. 515); whether Appellate Court improperly failed to apply bright line rule from Paranteau that judgment on merits is final for purposes of appeal even though amount of attorney's fees had not yet been determined.</i>	
Lewis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	906
Mercado v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	918
Murallo v. United Builders Supply Co. (Order)	913
Murray v. Suffield Police Dept. (Order)	902
Nichols v. Oxford (Order)	912
Randazzo v. Sakon (Order)	909
St. Juste v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	917
Saunders v. KDFBS, LLC (Order)	915
Smith v. Rudolph	138
<i>Action pursuant to statute (§ 52-556) waiving sovereign immunity when person is injured due to negligence of state employee while that employee is operating motor vehicle owned and insured by state; right to jury trial; motion to strike case from jury trial list; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that § 52-556 did not afford plaintiff right to jury trial; whether trial court properly struck plaintiff's case from jury trial list; whether § 52-556 expressly provides for right to jury trial.</i>	
Standard Petroleum Co. v. Faugno Acquisition, LLC	40
<i>Class action; claim that defendant petroleum company, which supplied gasoline products to plaintiff service station operators and franchisees, overcharged them by failing to apply certain federal tax credit and by charging state gross receipts tax; claim under Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); motions for class certification; standards that govern trial court's class certification decision, discussed; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that four prerequisites to class action set forth in applicable rule of practice (§ 9-7) were satisfied; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that common issues of law and fact predominated and that class action was superior to other methods of adjudication.</i>	
State v. Bagnaschi (Order)	907
State v. Bischoff (Order)	912
State v. Corver (Order)	916
State v. Crosby (Order)	911
State v. Dubuisson (Order)	914
State v. Fletcher (Order)	918

State v. Gerald A. (Order)	914
State v. Harris	91
<i>Felony murder; robbery first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery first degree; eyewitness identifications; motion to suppress; out-of-court identification of defendant by eyewitness to crimes at arraignment on unrelated charges; claim that trial court violated defendant's due process rights under federal constitution by denying his motion to suppress eyewitness' out-of-court and in-court identifications of him because out-of-court identification was product of unnecessarily suggestive procedure and neither identification was reliable; claim that, even if defendant's federal constitutional rights were not violated, admission of those identifications violated defendant's due process rights under state constitution; whether defendant was entitled to suppression of out-of-court and in-court identifications under federal constitution; whether identification procedure was unnecessarily suggestive; whether identification of defendant at arraignment proceeding was nevertheless reliable under totality of circumstances; modification of framework for determining reliability of identifications set forth in Neil v. Biggers (409 U.S. 188) to conform to recent developments in social science and law, as matter of state constitutional law; endorsement of factors that this court identified as matter of state evidentiary law in State v. Guilbert (306 Conn. 218) for determining reliability of identifications; adoption of burden shifting framework that New Jersey Supreme Court articulated in State v. Henderson (208 N.J. 208) for purposes of allocating burden of proof with respect to admissibility of identification that is product of unnecessarily suggestive identification procedure; claim that, if trial court had applied standard that this court adopted for purposes of state constitution in present case, it would have concluded that identification should be excluded as insufficiently unreliable.</i>	
State v. Harris (Order)	918
State v. Hearl (Order)	903
State v. Holmes (Order)	913
State v. Liebguth (Order)	901
State v. Papineau (Order)	916
State v. Ramos (Order)	917
State v. Raynor (Order)	910
State v. Reservation Services International, Inc. (Order)	915
State v. Smith (Orders)	908, 914
State v. Stephenson (Order)	908
State v. Taupier	149
<i>Threatening first degree; breach of peace second degree; disorderly conduct; motion to dismiss; claim that threatening statements directed toward Superior Court judge in e-mail sent to others constituted protected speech under federal and state constitutions; claim that first degree threatening statute (§ 53a-61aa [a] [3]) was unconstitutional under free speech provisions of federal and state constitutions because statute did not require state to prove that defendant, in threatening to commit crime of violence, had specific intent to terrorize target of threatening statements; claim that first amendment requires higher mens rea for threatening speech directed at public official; whether trial court's consideration of evidence regarding certain events following defendant's threatening statement constituted reversible error; whether evidence was sufficient to support defendant's convictions of threatening in first degree and disorderly conduct; indirect communication of threats through third parties, discussed.</i>	
State v. Turner (Order)	909
State v. Wynne (Order)	911
Sun Val, LLC v. Commissioner of Transportation	316
<i>Negligence; claim that trial court improperly considered certain regulations governing remediation; claim that trial court improperly failed to adopt removal plan proposed by expert witness; claim that trial court's award of damages was insufficient; whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiff landowner failed to mitigate damages resulting from deposit of material on plaintiff's property; whether trial court correctly concluded that plaintiff had failed to prove element of proximate causation with respect to claim for lost profits.</i>	
Tedesco v. Agoli (Order)	905
Traylor v. Gambrell (Order)	901
White v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	904
Zilkha v. Zilkha (Order)	913