


Received: _____



8. What areas of the law do you enjoy the most and why? Trial work. Very exciting and diverse, different factual situations, interesting evidentiary issues.
9. Approximately how many days a week do you work? 3-5
10. Approximately how many cases have you handled in the last year? _____
11. Colleges and law schools attended (include years of attendance, degrees and the years each degree was received):
Stonehill College 1966-1970 BA 1970 ,
Fairfield University 1970-1971 (overseas Taiwan 1971-74) 1974-1976 MA
12. Date and place of admission to Connecticut Bar and any other State or Federal Bar:
1980 New Haven, CT
13. Bar Association Memberships: Connecticut Bar Association (retired)
14. Service on community boards or charitable agencies or educational institutions:
N/A

15. Military service, if any, with years served, rank, duties, type of discharge and disability rating, if any:

N/A

16. Do you have any condition or illness that may impact your ability to serve as a judge?

No

17. Since your last appointment, have you ever been convicted of a crime (motor vehicle violations excepted)? No If yes, circumstances:

18. Since your last appointment, has a complaint been filed against you at the Judicial Review Council? No

If yes, state the date, the name of the complainant, substance of the complaint and the final disposition of the matter:

19. Have you ever failed to render a decision, within the appropriate time allowed, without proper legal authorization? No

ADDITIONAL SPACE FOR ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS: Please be sure to note the number of the question being answered.

Blank lined paper for writing.


Certification

I hereby certify the information contained in this questionnaire is true to the best of my knowledge.

Signature: Marguerite Schofield Date: 1/3/2018

State of Connecticut

GENERAL ASSEMBLY



JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Authorization for Release of Personal Information

I, Marylouise Schofield Black, do hereby authorize a review of and full disclosure of all records or any part thereof, concerning myself, by and to the Judiciary Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly, or a person employed by the committee, whether said records are of a public, private or confidential nature.

The intent of this authorization is to give my consent for full and complete disclosure of all transcripts and other records made by or in the possession of any educational institutions, financial or credit institutions, including records of deposits, withdrawals, and balances of checking and savings accounts and loans, and also records of commercial or retail credit agencies (including credit reports and/or ratings); public utilities; employment and pre-employment records, including background reports, sufficiency ratings, complaints or grievances filed by or against me, and salary records; real and personal property tax statements and records, wherever filed; records of complaints, arrest, trial and/or conviction for alleged or actual violations of the law, including criminal and/or traffic records; records of complaints of a civil nature made by or against me, wheresoever located and to include the records and recollection of attorneys-at-law or of other counsel whether representing me or another person in any case in which I presently have or have had an interest.

This release specifically includes, among other things, any records in the possession of the Connecticut Department of Revenue Services and any other State, Federal, or local tax assessing or collecting authority; any records including policy, premium, and claim information in the possession of any insurance company or agency; any personnel, disciplinary or other records in the possession of any branch of the United States armed forces or the military forces of any state.


It is the intent of this authorization to provide full and free access to the background and history of my personal life for the specific purpose of pursuing a background investigation which may provide pertinent data for the State of Connecticut to consider in determining my suitability for appointment by the General Assembly. It is my specific intent to provide access to personal information, however personal or confidential it may appear to be, and the sources of information specifically enumerated above are not intended to deny access to any records not specifically mentioned herein.

I understand that any information obtained by the personal history background investigation which is developed directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, upon this release authorization will be considered in determining my suitability for appointment by the General Assembly.

A photocopy or facsimile of this release will be valid as original hereof, even though the said photocopy or facsimile does not contain an original writing of my signature.

Signature: Marylouise Schofield Black Date: January 2, 2018
Date of Birth: 6/8/1948 Social Sec. No: 043-40-9182

***This release shall terminate upon completion of the signatory's nomination/renomination.**



CONNECTICUT JUDICIAL BRANCH

Biographical Information for Reappointment Purposes For Judges and Family Support Magistrates

Name: Marylouise Schofield-Black

Current Assignment: Waterbury Judicial District-Family

Assignments over the last term:

Year of Appointment to Bench: 2002

Law School: Pace University

Undergraduate School & Degree: Stonehill College BA 1970 Fairfield University, MA 1976

Honors and Awards received during last term:

Boards and Commissions (During last term):

Other Pertinent Information:



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
JUDICIAL BRANCH

SUPERIOR COURT OPERATIONS

JUDGE SUPPORT SERVICES

Judicial Performance Evaluation Program

90 Washington Street, Third Floor
Hartford, Connecticut 06106
860-706-5157 Fax 860-706-5086
e-mail: jpep@jud.ct.gov

February 7, 2018

Hon. Marylouise Schofield
243 Westport Road
Easton, CT 06612

Dear Judge Schofield:

Enclosed, for your information, are copies of your evaluation reports that were recently sent to the Judiciary Committee pursuant to C.G.S. Sec. 2-40a.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Deirdre M. McPadden", is written over a horizontal line.

Deirdre M. McPadden
Director, Judge Support Services

DMP:cc
Enclosures

* * * JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUMMARY * * *

(New 2001)

NAME OF JUDGE	PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS	
Hon. Marylouise Schofield	Total No. of Respondents:	49
	Years in Practice:	
	Less than 5	0
	Five to Ten	1
	More than 10	48
	Not Ans.	0

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

1	<u>Excellent/Good</u>	<u>Fair/Poor</u>
Comportment		
All Judges Combined	89.60 %	10.40 %
Individual Judge	93.90 %	6.10 %
2	<u>Excellent/Good</u>	<u>Fair/Poor</u>
Legal Ability		
All Judges Combined	89.10 %	10.90 %
Individual Judge	90.00 %	10.00 %
3	<u>Excellent/Good</u>	<u>Fair/Poor</u>
Management Skills		
All Judges Combined	90.70 %	9.20 %
Individual Judge	91.60 %	8.40 %

1. Judicial Demeanor, Impartiality of Conduct.
2. Knowledge of Substantive Law, Knowledge of Procedure in Case, Knowledge of Rules of Evidence.
3. Pace of Proceedings, Explanation of Rulings, Latitude Allowed to Attorneys, Attention/Staying on Top of Proceedings, Promptness in Making Rulings.

Judge No:

2001 ATTORNEY QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE

ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (05/07/2001 - 07/25/2016)

INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (09/17/2013 - 07/25/2016)

SECTION 2

*** FULL REPORT ***

A. Disposition Total:

All Judges Combined	37,800
Individual Judge	49

1. Judgment After Trial		
All Judges Combined	22,678	60.0%
Individual Judge	13	26.5%
2. Mistrial or Motion		
All Judges Combined	299	0.8%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

3. Case Settled or Judgment		
All Judges Combined	2,229	5.9%
Individual Judge	1	2.0%
4. Court Enters Order		
All Judges Combined	9,288	24.6%
Individual Judge	26	53.1%
9. Not Answered		
All Judges Combined	3,306	8.7%
Individual Judge	9	18.4%

B. Type of Case:

1. Family Relations		
All Judges Combined	7,670	20.3%
Individual Judge	43	87.8%
2. Housing		
All Judges Combined	1,237	3.3%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%
3. Juvenile		
All Judges Combined	4,892	12.9%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%
4. Administrative Appeal		
All Judges Combined	727	1.9%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

5. Civil		
All Judges Combined	13,950	36.9%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%
6. Criminal		
All Judges Combined	5,450	14.4%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%
7. Motor Vehicle/Infraction		
All Judges Combined	242	0.6%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%
8. Other		
All Judges Combined	1,859	4.9%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%
9. Not Answered		
All Judges Combined	1,773	4.7%
Individual Judge	6	12.2%

C. Type of Trial:

1. Non-Jury		
All Judges Combined	19,662	52.0%
Individual Judge	31	63.3%
2. Jury		
All Judges Combined	10,280	27.2%
Individual Judge	1	2.0%
9. Not Answered		
All Judges Combined	7,858	20.8%
Individual Judge	17	34.7%

D. Party Represented:

1. Plaintiff/Prosecution		
All Judges Combined	13,045	34.5%
Individual Judge	20	40.8%
2. Defendant		
All Judges Combined	12,821	33.9%
Individual Judge	9	18.4%
3. Other		
All Judges Combined	2,902	7.7%
Individual Judge	2	4.1%
9. Not Answered		
All Judges Combined	9,032	23.9%
Individual Judge	18	36.7%

Judge No:

2001 ATTORNEY QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE

ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (05/07/2001 - 07/25/2016)

INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (09/17/2013 - 07/25/2016)

SECTION 3 - Judges Conduct of Proceedings

	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor	
A. Pace of Proceedings								
All Judges Combined	24,018	63.9%	10,382	27.6%	2,146	5.7%	1,033	2.7%
Individual Judge	25	51.0%	21	42.9%	2	4.1%	1	2.0%
B. Explanation of Rulings								
All Judges Combined	21,344	59.2%	10,038	27.8%	2,885	8.0%	1,787	5.0%
Individual Judge	20	43.5%	18	39.1%	4	8.7%	4	8.7%
C. Latitude Allowed to Attorneys								
All Judges Combined	22,220	59.3%	10,799	28.8%	2,845	7.6%	1,596	4.3%
Individual Judge	30	61.2%	13	26.5%	6	12.2%	0	0.0%
D. Attention/Staying on Top of Proceedings								
All Judges Combined	27,484	73.3%	7,673	20.5%	1,591	4.2%	750	2.0%
Individual Judge	33	67.3%	14	28.6%	1	2.0%	1	2.0%
E. Promptness in Making Rulings								
All Judges Combined	26,010	72.0%	7,682	21.3%	1,690	4.7%	727	2.0%
Individual Judge	33	68.8%	14	29.2%	0	0.0%	1	2.1%
F. Knowledge of Substantive Law								
All Judges Combined	23,444	63.4%	9,007	24.4%	2,773	7.5%	1,741	4.7%
Individual Judge	30	66.7%	11	24.4%	2	4.4%	2	4.4%
G. Knowledge of Procedure								
All Judges Combined	24,911	67.0%	8,869	23.8%	2,146	5.8%	1,277	3.4%
Individual Judge	29	59.2%	15	30.6%	1	2.0%	4	8.2%
H. Knowledge of Rules of Evidence								
All Judges Combined	23,272	65.1%	8,462	23.7%	2,503	7.0%	1,491	4.2%
Individual Judge	27	58.7%	14	30.4%	4	8.7%	1	2.2%
I. Clarity of Decision								
All Judges Combined	22,407	63.2%	8,559	24.1%	2,718	7.7%	1,777	5.0%
Individual Judge	25	54.3%	13	28.3%	4	8.7%	4	8.7%
J. Clarity of Charge								
All Judges Combined	7,223	60.2%	3,397	28.3%	982	8.2%	400	3.3%
Individual Judge	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
K. Balance/Neutrality of Charge								
All Judges Combined	8,528	67.5%	2,959	23.4%	740	5.9%	414	3.3%
Individual Judge	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
L. Judicial Demeanor								
All Judges Combined	26,672	71.5%	6,796	18.2%	2,180	5.8%	1,654	4.4%
Individual Judge	34	69.4%	11	22.4%	3	6.1%	1	2.0%
M. Impartiality of Conduct								
All Judges Combined	27,045	72.4%	6,396	17.1%	2,072	5.5%	1,862	5.0%
Individual Judge	34	69.4%	13	26.5%	2	4.1%	0	0.0%

Judge No:

2001 ATTORNEY QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE

ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (05/07/2001 - 07/25/2016)

INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (09/17/2013 - 07/25/2016)

SECTION 4

A. How Many Years Practiced Law?

1. Less than 5		
All Judges Combined	3,308	8.8%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%
2. 5 to 10		
All Judges Combined	5,535	14.6%
Individual Judge	1	2.0%
3. More than 10		
All Judges Combined	28,675	75.9%
Individual Judge	48	98.0%
9. Not Answered		
All Judges Combined	282	0.7%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

C. Evaluated Judge in the Past Year

1. 3 or Less Times		
All Judges Combined	34,636	90.1%
Individual Judge	48	98.0%
2. More than 3 Times		
All Judges Combined	2,263	5.9%
Individual Judge	1	2.0%
9. Not Answered		
All Judges Combined	901	2.3%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

B. Major Part of Practice

1. Criminal			
All Judges Combined	11,424	17.1%	
Individual Judge	7	7.4%	
2. Juvenile			
All Judges Combined	5,976	9.0%	
Individual Judge	2	2.1%	
3. Housing			
All Judges Combined	2,848	4.3%	
Individual Judge	5	5.3%	
4. Family Relations			
All Judges Combined	11,037	16.6%	
Individual Judge	46	48.4%	
5. Civil			
All Judges Combined	21,933	32.9%	
Individual Judge	18	18.9%	
6. General Practice			
All Judges Combined	9,971	15.0%	
Individual Judge	16	16.8%	
9. Not Answered			
All Judges Combined	404	0.6%	
Individual Judge	1	1.1%	

Hon. Marylouise Schofield

* * * JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUMMARY * * *

(New 2001)

NAME OF JUDGE	PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS	
Hon. Marylouise Schofield	Total No. of Respondents:	53
	Years in Practice:	
	Less than 5	4
	Five to Ten	3
	More than 10	46
EVALUATION PERIOD	Not Ans.	0
03/30/2011 - 09/16/2013		

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

1	<u>Excellent/Good</u>	<u>Fair/Poor</u>
Comportment		
All Judges Combined	89.40 %	10.70 %
Individual Judge	98.10 %	2.00 %
2	<u>Excellent/Good</u>	<u>Fair/Poor</u>
Legal Ability		
All Judges Combined	88.90 %	11.10 %
Individual Judge	89.80 %	10.20 %
3	<u>Excellent/Good</u>	<u>Fair/Poor</u>
Management Skills		
All Judges Combined	90.60 %	9.40 %
Individual Judge	90.30 %	9.70 %

1. Judicial Demeanor, Impartiality of Conduct.
2. Knowledge of Substantive Law, Knowledge of Procedure in Case, Knowledge of Rules of Evidence.
3. Pace of Proceedings, Explanation of Rulings, Latitude Allowed to Attorneys, Attention/Staying on Top of Proceedings, Promptness in Making Rulings.

Judge No:

2001 ATTORNEY QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE

ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (05/07/2001 - 09/16/2013)

INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (03/30/2011 - 09/16/2013)

SECTION 2

*** FULL REPORT ***

A. Disposition Total:

All Judges Combined	31,729
Individual Judge	53

1. Judgment After Trial

All Judges Combined	19,252	60.7%
Individual Judge	16	30.2%

2. Mistrial or Motion

All Judges Combined	243	0.8%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

3. Case Settled or Judgment

All Judges Combined	1,949	6.1%
Individual Judge	1	1.9%

4. Court Enters Order

All Judges Combined	7,739	24.4%
Individual Judge	32	60.4%

9. Not Answered

All Judges Combined	2,546	8.0%
Individual Judge	4	7.5%

B. Type of Case:

1. Family Relations

All Judges Combined	6,235	19.7%
Individual Judge	50	94.3%

2. Housing

All Judges Combined	1,004	3.2%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

3. Juvenile

All Judges Combined	4,399	13.9%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

4. Administrative Appeal

All Judges Combined	612	1.9%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

5. Civil

All Judges Combined	11,653	36.7%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

6. Criminal

All Judges Combined	4,622	14.6%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

7. Motor Vehicle/Infraction

All Judges Combined	212	0.7%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

8. Other

All Judges Combined	1,509	4.8%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

9. Not Answered

All Judges Combined	1,483	4.7%
Individual Judge	3	5.7%

C. Type of Trial:

1. Non-Jury

All Judges Combined	16,284	51.3%
Individual Judge	36	67.9%

2. Jury

All Judges Combined	8,848	27.9%
Individual Judge	2	3.8%

9. Not Answered

All Judges Combined	6,597	20.8%
Individual Judge	15	28.3%

D. Party Represented:

1. Plaintiff/Prosecution

All Judges Combined	10,825	34.1%
Individual Judge	15	28.3%

2. Defendant

All Judges Combined	10,761	33.9%
Individual Judge	21	39.6%

3. Other

All Judges Combined	2,585	8.1%
Individual Judge	1	1.9%

9. Not Answered

All Judges Combined	7,558	23.8%
Individual Judge	16	30.2%

Judge No:

2001 ATTORNEY QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE

ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (05/07/2001 - 09/16/2013)

INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (03/30/2011 - 09/16/2013)

SECTION 3 - Judges Conduct of Proceedings

	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor	
A. Pace of Proceedings								
All Judges Combined	19,872	63.0%	8,980	28.5%	1,840	5.8%	868	2.8%
Individual Judge	30	56.6%	18	34.0%	1	1.9%	4	7.5%
B. Explanation of Rulings								
All Judges Combined	17,671	58.2%	8,686	28.6%	2,481	8.2%	1,504	5.0%
Individual Judge	26	52.0%	14	28.0%	5	10.0%	5	10.0%
C. Latitude Allowed to Attorneys								
All Judges Combined	18,370	58.4%	9,308	29.6%	2,405	7.6%	1,375	4.4%
Individual Judge	33	62.3%	14	26.4%	4	7.5%	2	3.8%
D. Attention/Staying on Top of Proceedings								
All Judges Combined	22,901	72.7%	6,589	20.9%	1,357	4.3%	643	2.0%
Individual Judge	37	71.2%	13	25.0%	2	3.8%	0	0.0%
E. Promptness in Making Rulings								
All Judges Combined	21,709	71.4%	6,634	21.8%	1,442	4.7%	623	2.0%
Individual Judge	36	70.6%	13	25.5%	2	3.9%	0	0.0%
F. Knowledge of Substantive Law								
All Judges Combined	19,381	62.4%	7,791	25.1%	2,377	7.7%	1,486	4.8%
Individual Judge	36	67.9%	10	18.9%	6	11.3%	1	1.9%
G. Knowledge of Procedure								
All Judges Combined	20,642	66.1%	7,703	24.6%	1,838	5.9%	1,068	3.4%
Individual Judge	36	67.9%	15	28.3%	1	1.9%	1	1.9%
H. Knowledge of Rules of Evidence								
All Judges Combined	19,295	64.2%	7,313	24.3%	2,153	7.2%	1,276	4.2%
Individual Judge	32	61.5%	13	25.0%	4	7.7%	3	5.8%
I. Clarity of Decision								
All Judges Combined	18,613	62.4%	7,422	24.9%	2,319	7.8%	1,491	5.0%
Individual Judge	30	63.8%	10	21.3%	5	10.6%	2	4.3%
J. Clarity of Charge								
All Judges Combined	5,996	58.7%	2,998	29.3%	874	8.6%	354	3.5%
Individual Judge	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
K. Balance/Neutrality of Charge								
All Judges Combined	7,114	66.2%	2,606	24.3%	655	6.1%	366	3.4%
Individual Judge	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
L. Judicial Demeanor								
All Judges Combined	22,224	71.0%	5,813	18.6%	1,871	6.0%	1,402	4.5%
Individual Judge	42	82.4%	8	15.7%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%
M. Impartiality of Conduct								
All Judges Combined	22,534	71.8%	5,468	17.4%	1,778	5.7%	1,588	5.1%
Individual Judge	41	82.0%	8	16.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%

Hon. Marylouise Schofield

JUDGE EVALUATION

RUN DATE: 09/16/2013

Judge No:

2001 ATTORNEY QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE

ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (05/07/2001 - 09/16/2013)

INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (03/30/2011 - 09/16/2013)

SECTION 4

A. How Many Years Practiced Law?

1. Less than 5			
All Judges Combined	2,749	8.7%	
Individual Judge	4	7.5%	
2. 5 to 10			
All Judges Combined	4,859	15.3%	
Individual Judge	3	5.7%	
3. More than 10			
All Judges Combined	23,884	75.3%	
Individual Judge	46	86.8%	
9. Not Answered			
All Judges Combined	237	0.7%	
Individual Judge	0	0.0%	

B. Major Part of Practice

1. Criminal				
All Judges Combined	9,630	17.3%		
Individual Judge	4	4.9%		
2. Juvenile				
All Judges Combined	5,312	9.6%		
Individual Judge	1	1.2%		
3. Housing				
All Judges Combined	2,270	4.1%		
Individual Judge	2	2.5%		
4. Family Relations				
All Judges Combined	9,118	16.4%		
Individual Judge	51	63.0%		
5. Civil				
All Judges Combined	18,345	33.0%		
Individual Judge	13	16.0%		
6. General Practice				
All Judges Combined	8,489	15.3%		
Individual Judge	10	12.3%		
9. Not Answered				
All Judges Combined	355	0.6%		
Individual Judge	0	0.0%		

C. Evaluated Judge in the Past Year

1. 3 or Less Times			
All Judges Combined	28,969	89.8%	
Individual Judge	47	88.7%	
2. More than 3 Times			
All Judges Combined	1,969	6.1%	
Individual Judge	5	9.4%	
9. Not Answered			
All Judges Combined	791	2.5%	
Individual Judge	1	1.9%	

Hon. Marylouise Schofield

* * * JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUMMARY * * *

(New 2001)

NAME OF JUDGE	PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS		
Hon. Marylouise Schofield	Total No. of Respondents:		30
	Years in Practice:		
	Less than 5	-	1
	Five to Ten	-	1
	More than 10	-	28
EVALUATION PERIOD 10/10/2008 - 03/29/2011	Not Ans.	-	0

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

1	<u>Excellent/Good</u>	<u>Fair/Poor</u>
Comportment		
All Judges Combined	89.10 %	11.00 %
Individual Judge	81.70 %	18.30 %
2	<u>Excellent/Good</u>	<u>Fair/Poor</u>
Legal Ability		
All Judges Combined	88.70 %	11.30 %
Individual Judge	73.00 %	27.00 %
3	<u>Excellent/Good</u>	<u>Fair/Poor</u>
Management Skills		
All Judges Combined	90.40 %	9.60 %
Individual Judge	80.70 %	19.30 %

1. Judicial Demeanor, Impartiality of Conduct.
2. Knowledge of Substantive Law, Knowledge of Procedure in Case, Knowledge of Rules of Evidence.
3. Pace of Proceedings, Explanation of Rulings, Latitude Allowed to Attorneys, Attention/Staying on Top of Proceedings, Promptness in Making Rulings.

Judge No:

2001 ATTORNEY QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE

ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (05/07/2001 - 03/29/2011)

INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (10/10/2008 - 03/29/2011)

SECTION 2

*** FULL REPORT ***

A. Disposition Total:

All Judges Combined	26,200
Individual Judge	30

1. Judgment After Trial

All Judges Combined	16,116	61.5%
Individual Judge	12	40.0%

2. Mistrial or Motion

All Judges Combined	191	0.7%
Individual Judge	2	6.7%

3. Case Settled or Judgment

All Judges Combined	1,652	6.3%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

4. Court Enters Order

All Judges Combined	6,241	23.8%
Individual Judge	14	46.7%

9. Not Answered

All Judges Combined	2,000	7.6%
Individual Judge	2	6.7%

B. Type of Case:

1. Family Relations

All Judges Combined	4,863	18.6%
Individual Judge	17	56.7%

2. Housing

All Judges Combined	782	3.0%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

3. Juvenile

All Judges Combined	3,841	14.7%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

4. Administrative Appeal

All Judges Combined	534	2.0%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

5. Civil

All Judges Combined	9,820	37.5%
Individual Judge	10	33.3%

6. Criminal

All Judges Combined	3,821	14.6%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

7. Motor Vehicle/Infraction

All Judges Combined	159	0.6%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

8. Other

All Judges Combined	1,152	4.4%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

9. Not Answered

All Judges Combined	1,228	4.7%
Individual Judge	3	10.0%

C. Type of Trial:

1. Non-Jury

All Judges Combined	13,166	50.3%
Individual Judge	19	63.3%

2. Jury

All Judges Combined	7,551	28.8%
Individual Judge	2	6.7%

9. Not Answered

All Judges Combined	5,483	20.9%
Individual Judge	9	30.0%

D. Party Represented:

1. Plaintiff/Prosecution

All Judges Combined	8,878	33.9%
Individual Judge	13	43.3%

2. Defendant

All Judges Combined	8,920	34.0%
Individual Judge	6	20.0%

3. Other

All Judges Combined	2,189	8.4%
Individual Judge	1	3.3%

9. Not Answered

All Judges Combined	6,213	23.7%
Individual Judge	10	33.3%

Hon. Marylouise Schofield

Judge No:

2001 ATTORNEY QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE

ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (05/07/2001 - 03/29/2011)

INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (10/10/2008 - 03/29/2011)

SECTION 3 - Judges Conduct of Proceedings

	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor	
A. Pace of Proceedings								
All Judges Combined	16,160	62.0%	7,630	29.3%	1,548	5.9%	725	2.8%
Individual Judge	17	56.7%	8	26.7%	4	13.3%	1	3.3%
B. Explanation of Rulings								
All Judges Combined	14,332	57.2%	7,349	29.3%	2,127	8.5%	1,269	5.1%
Individual Judge	15	50.0%	4	13.3%	7	23.3%	4	13.3%
C. Latitude Allowed to Attorneys								
All Judges Combined	14,863	57.2%	7,906	30.4%	2,047	7.9%	1,170	4.5%
Individual Judge	19	63.3%	7	23.3%	4	13.3%	0	0.0%
D. Attention/Staying on Top of Proceedings								
All Judges Combined	18,690	71.8%	5,625	21.6%	1,146	4.4%	555	2.1%
Individual Judge	22	73.3%	2	6.7%	2	6.7%	4	13.3%
E. Promptness in Making Rulings								
All Judges Combined	17,702	70.4%	5,694	22.6%	1,235	4.9%	525	2.1%
Individual Judge	21	70.0%	6	20.0%	2	6.7%	1	3.3%
F. Knowledge of Substantive Law								
All Judges Combined	15,677	61.2%	6,698	26.1%	2,014	7.9%	1,246	4.9%
Individual Judge	16	55.2%	5	17.2%	4	13.8%	4	13.8%
G. Knowledge of Procedure								
All Judges Combined	16,762	64.9%	6,608	25.6%	1,543	6.0%	895	3.5%
Individual Judge	18	60.0%	5	16.7%	3	10.0%	4	13.3%
H. Knowledge of Rules of Evidence								
All Judges Combined	15,627	63.1%	6,264	25.3%	1,830	7.4%	1,063	4.3%
Individual Judge	18	60.0%	3	10.0%	5	16.7%	4	13.3%
I. Clarity of Decision								
All Judges Combined	15,128	61.2%	6,355	25.7%	1,957	7.9%	1,260	5.1%
Individual Judge	19	63.3%	5	16.7%	5	16.7%	1	3.3%
J. Clarity of Charge								
All Judges Combined	4,925	57.0%	2,643	30.6%	763	8.8%	312	3.6%
Individual Judge	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
K. Balance/Neutrality of Charge								
All Judges Combined	5,869	64.9%	2,286	25.3%	567	6.3%	323	3.6%
Individual Judge	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
L. Judicial Demeanor								
All Judges Combined	18,079	69.9%	4,991	19.3%	1,581	6.1%	1,204	4.7%
Individual Judge	22	73.3%	3	10.0%	4	13.3%	1	3.3%
M. Impartiality of Conduct								
All Judges Combined	18,355	70.9%	4,668	18.0%	1,497	5.8%	1,381	5.3%
Individual Judge	23	76.7%	1	3.3%	2	6.7%	4	13.3%

Judge No:

2001 ATTORNEY QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE

ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (05/07/2001 - 03/29/2011)

INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (10/10/2008 - 03/29/2011)

SECTION 4

A. How Many Years Practiced Law?

1. Less than 5		
All Judges Combined	2,360	9.0%
Individual Judge	1	3.3%
2. 5 to 10		
All Judges Combined	4,064	15.5%
Individual Judge	1	3.3%
3. More than 10		
All Judges Combined	19,579	74.7%
Individual Judge	28	93.3%
9. Not Answered		
All Judges Combined	197	0.8%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

C. Evaluated Judge in the Past Year

1. 3 or Less Times		
All Judges Combined	23,944	91.0%
Individual Judge	29	96.7%
2. More than 3 Times		
All Judges Combined	1,597	6.1%
Individual Judge	1	3.3%
9. Not Answered		
All Judges Combined	659	2.5%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

B. Major Part of Practice

1. Criminal				
All Judges Combined	7,856	17.3%		
Individual Judge	4	8.2%		
2. Juvenile				
All Judges Combined	4,531	10.0%		
Individual Judge	0	0.0%		
3. Housing				
All Judges Combined	1,804	4.0%		
Individual Judge	3	6.1%		
4. Family Relations				
All Judges Combined	7,351	16.2%		
Individual Judge	21	42.9%		
5. Civil				
All Judges Combined	15,222	33.5%		
Individual Judge	16	32.7%		
6. General Practice				
All Judges Combined	7,121	15.7%		
Individual Judge	5	10.2%		
9. Not Answered				
All Judges Combined	301	0.7%		
Individual Judge	0	0.0%		

JE5211

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PAGE: 2

JUDGE EVALUATION

RUN DATE: 03/29/2011

Judge No:

JUROR QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE REPORT

ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (07/01/1991 - 03/29/2011)

INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (10/10/2008 - 03/29/2011)

Type of Proceeding

1. Civil

All Judges Combined	39,102	58.8%
Individual Judge	13	100.0%

2. Criminal

All Judges Combined	26,970	40.5%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

9. Not Answered

All Judges Combined	456	0.7%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%

Hon. Marylouise Schofield

JUDGE EVALUATION

RUN DATE: 03/29/2011

Judge No:

JUROR QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE REPORT

ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (07/01/1991 - 03/29/2011)

INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (10/10/2008 - 03/29/2011)

SECTION 1 - Judge's Attitude Toward

	Strongly Against		Somewhat Against		Neutral		Somewhat For		Strongly For	
A. Plaintiff/Prosecutor										
All Judges Combined	73	0.1%	706	1.1%	64,089	97.3%	776	1.2%	223	0.3%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
B. Defendant										
All Judges Combined	74	0.1%	771	1.2%	64,283	97.7%	503	0.8%	164	0.2%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
C. Women										
All Judges Combined	22	0.0%	92	0.1%	62,145	99.3%	188	0.3%	119	0.2%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
D. Men										
All Judges Combined	14	0.0%	55	0.1%	62,849	99.6%	95	0.2%	111	0.2%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
E. Minorities										
All Judges Combined	21	0.0%	75	0.1%	53,523	99.3%	124	0.2%	132	0.2%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
F. People of Particular Religion										
All Judges Combined	13	0.0%	26	0.1%	45,267	99.7%	36	0.1%	75	0.2%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
G. Poor People										
All Judges Combined	27	0.1%	44	0.1%	46,846	99.4%	96	0.2%	104	0.2%
Individual Judge	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Judge No:

JUROR QUESTIONNAIRES - ALL JUDGES COMBINED COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL JUDGE REPORT
 ALL JUDGES COMBINED - (07/01/1991 - 03/29/2011)
 INDIVIDUAL JUDGE - (10/10/2008 - 03/29/2011)

SECTION 2

	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor	
A. Dignity of Proceedings								
All Judges Combined	52,214	79.2%	12,603	19.1%	1,098	1.7%	34	0.1%
Individual Judge	13	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
B. Attentiveness During Proceedings								
All Judges Combined	48,217	72.9%	15,667	23.7%	2,074	3.1%	218	0.3%
Individual Judge	13	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
C. Patience During Proceedings								
All Judges Combined	50,684	76.5%	13,781	20.8%	1,657	2.5%	122	0.2%
Individual Judge	13	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
D. Courtesy								
All Judges Combined	57,720	87.2%	7,636	11.5%	757	1.1%	57	0.1%
Individual Judge	13	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
E. Explanation of Proceedings								
All Judges Combined	55,416	83.6%	9,544	14.4%	1,175	1.8%	117	0.2%
Individual Judge	12	92.3%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
F. Keep Proceedings Going Efficiently								
All Judges Combined	47,372	71.6%	15,524	23.4%	2,821	4.3%	484	0.7%
Individual Judge	11	84.6%	2	15.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
G. Clarity of Charge								
All Judges Combined	49,714	76.9%	12,653	19.6%	2,011	3.1%	279	0.4%
Individual Judge	13	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%



STATE OF CONNECTICUT

JUDICIAL SELECTION COMMISSION

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SITTING JUDGES SEEKING REAPPOINTMENT

NAME: Marylouise Schofield DATE: 12/15/2016

Please answer all questions immediately following the question. Please do not staple any documents together.

1. State your home address and telephone number.

243 Westport Rd
Easton, CT. 06612
203-220-9679

2. State the date and place of your birth.

June 8, 1948, Norwalk, CT

3. State the date of your initial appointment as a judge and any reappointments.

May, 2002
May, 2010

4. Can you perform the duties and functions of the position as a judge at all times as required? If you are unable to so perform, with reasonable accommodation, please explain. Please fill out the attached general medical release form.

Yes

5. Do you or any member of your immediate family presently have any business connections, including any membership on any Board of Directors that would give rise to any conflict of interest, per Canon 3 of the Code of Judicial Conduct?

No

TEL. (860) 256-2957
FAX: (860) 256-2956
18-20 Trinity Street, Hartford, CT 06106
An Equal Opportunity Employer

6. Do you authorize the immediate release to the Judicial Selection Commission of the following information concerning you?

(a) Any Judicial Branch evaluations.

yes

(b) Any correspondence and/or complaints or actions taken by the Judicial Review Council.

yes

7. Since the date of your last appointment, have you engaged in the possession, use or sale of illegal drugs?

No

8. Since the date of your last appointment, have you utilized the contempt power for any action occurring in the presence of the court other than for the enforcement of matrimonial orders? If so, please explain each occasion.

No

9. Since the date of your last appointment, are you aware of any complaints concerning your conduct being made to a person within the judicial system, including any administrative judge or the Chief Court Administrator, or to the Office of the Governor, the Judicial Review Council or to any Grievance Committee? If so, please explain the complaint and the disposition of the complaint.

Yes, 1 case, dismissed. Woman in family court repeatedly denied the father access to his children. Held her in lock-up for 2 hours to reconsider

10. Since the date of your last appointment, are you aware of any complaints made to or about you by lawyers and/or litigants concerning your temperament or your alleged conduct in the courtroom? If yes, please explain.

No

11. Since the date of your last appointment, please provide your court assignments chronologically.

Bridgeport Family
New Haven "
Waterbury "

12. Since the date of your last appointment, have you been arrested, charged or held by federal, state or other law enforcement authorities for violation of any law? If so, please explain.

No

13. State all civic, charitable or social organizations with which you are associated.

N/A

14. List any honors, prizes, awards or other forms of recognition which you have received.

N/A

15. Since the date of your last appointment, have you ever been a party (real rather than nominal) in any legal proceedings? If so, please explain.

No

16. List the five most significant decisions and/or cases in which you have been involved since the date of your last appointment.

To be provided

17. Have you published legal writings, other than judicial opinions, during the last term of your appointment? If so, please provide the citation(s).

No

18. Please provide a list of cases since the date of your last appointment in which an appeal was taken to the Appellate Court or Supreme Court from a decision rendered by you. Please provide the citations to the Appellate and Supreme Court opinions and briefly state the central issue and the result of the appeal.

To be provided

19. Was any criminal sentence imposed by you subsequently reduced or increased by the Sentence Review Division? If so, please explain.

No

20. Have you ever been asked to disqualify yourself where you have refused to do so? If so, please explain.

No

21. Please provide the names and addresses of five lawyers who have appeared most frequently before you in the past two years.

To be provided

In addition, please list two judges with whom the Commission can consult concerning your continuing qualifications/ability to serve as a judge of the Superior Court.

The Hon. Mark Taylor, A.J., Waterbury J.D.

The Hon. Barbara J. Sheedy, Waterbury J.D.

22. Do you presently sit on any state boards or commissions, such as Sentencing Review Division, Judicial Inquiry Commission, Criminal Justice Commission, Public Defender Commission, and/or Judicial Review Council? If so, what are the terms of such appointments?

No

23. Please attach a copy of your latest resume to your completed questionnaire.

To be provided

24. Have you ever filed for bankruptcy or had bankruptcy proceedings initiated against you? If so, please explain.

No

25. Do you presently have any non-current unpaid tax obligations? If so, please explain.

No

26. Is there anything not otherwise disclosed above concerning you or any member of your immediate family that (i) would be embarrassing with respect to the judicial office you hold should that information be publicized or (ii) could adversely affect your ability to continue to serve as a judge? If so, please explain.

No

27. Please make any additional statement about your judicial or personal experiences that you believe are relevant to your reappointment.

No additional statement.

28. During your time on the bench, have you fined a lawyer for any reason whatsoever? If so, explain each such incident even if it was subsequently vacated (date, court, amount, case, circumstances). (Provide transcript if available).

Yes. The incident occurred many years ago. An attorney continued to argue with the court despite repeatedly being requested to sit down and be silent. He continued to argue with the court, and was warned that he would be fined \$100.00 to be donated to a charity of his choosing. He continued to argue and was fined. I can't remember the name of the case as it was so many years ago. The attorney's name was Kevin Collins. The incident occurred in the Stamford Courthouse approximately 12 years ago.

29. No.

30. No.

31. During your time on the bench, have you ever revoked the appointment of a public defender or any person for any reason? If so, please describe the circumstances in detail, including the date, court, name of case and reasons. (Provide transcript if available).

No

32. During your time on the bench, have you ever held anyone in contempt for anything other than non-compliance with a court order? If so, please describe the circumstances, including sanctions imposed, in detail. (Provide transcript if available).

No

I hereby attest that the responses made to the questions in this application are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Marylouise S. Clark Schofield
Signature

Marylouise Schofield
Print or type name

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of December, 2016

Dheer A. Rousseau

Commissioner of the Superior Court

Notary Public

My Commission expires: 7-31-19

GENERAL RELEASE


Please complete and attach this page to your response to the questionnaire.

I understand that the completion and filing of this questionnaire and supplemental information and the interview with members of the Connecticut Judicial Selection Commission will be the basis for a finding by such Commission of my present qualifications for judicial office. I agree to furnish additional information orally or in writing as may be required to said Commission. I hereby request and authorize any persons whose knowledge of my person and character might otherwise be considered privileged to furnish such information as it relates to my qualifications to serve as a judge as may be requested by such Commission.

I hereby authorize the Commission to release a copy of this questionnaire to the Office of the Governor and to the Judiciary Committee of the General Assembly.


I hereby request and authorize any Grievance Committee, the Office of the Governor, the Chief Court Administrator's Office, the Judicial Review Council, the Judiciary Committee of the Connecticut Bar Association, and the Judicial Branch to disclose to said Commission the contents of any file containing a complaint or evaluation concerning me. I understand that such disclosures will be made in order that said Commission may make a general evaluation of my fitness for judicial office. I further understand that said Commission will not disclose to any person the existence of any such file or the contents thereof.

I hereby attest that the responses made to the questions in this application are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.


Signature

Marylouise Schofield
Print or type name

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15 day of December, 20 16


Commissioner of the Superior Court
Notary Public

~~My Commission expires:~~ _____

MEDICAL RELEASE

Please complete and attach this page to your response to the questionnaire.

Name and address of your primary care physician:

Sally Bergwerk, M.D.
35 Old Ridgefield Rd.
Wilton, CT. 06897

I hereby authorize and request Dr. Sally Bergwerk, based upon his/her review of my medical records, to disclose to and advise the Judicial Selection Commission whether he/she has any concerns regarding my fitness for judicial office or reason to believe that I am unable to perform the duties and functions of my judicial office. If Dr. Bergwerk has no such concerns or knows of no such reasons, this release should not be construed as a general release of my medical records. If Dr. Bergwerk has any such concerns or knows of any such reasons, Dr. Bergwerk is authorized and requested to disclose any medical records germane to those concerns or reasons.

Dated at Waterbury, CT, this 8th day of December, 2016.

Marylouise Schofield
Signature

Marylouise Schofield
Print or Type Name

Witnessed:

[Signature]
Commissioner of the Superior Court
Notary Public
~~My Commission Expires:~~

Marylouise S. Schofield
~~Newtown, CT 06470~~
Easton, CT. 06612

Summary: ¹⁵
15 years superior Court Judge, State of Connecticut
20 years of successful litigation practice in Connecticut
Admin. Trial Judge, Hearing Officer,, State Dept. Of Education, Since 19097
Trial Referee, Judicial District of Danbury, since 1990
Trial Referee, Judicial District of Stamford/Norwalk, since 1993

Litigation: Preparation of case from initial client interview through settlement and/or trial. Experience in negligence, personal injury, malpractice, administrative and zoning appeals, dissolution, counsel for children in custody disputes. All aspects of civil, contracts, torts, UCC, consumer protection, collection, unemployment. Plaintiff/Defense litigation. Criminal defense work has encompassed primarily misdemeanor arraignments, plea bargaining, motor vehicle, youthful offenders, applications for accelerated rehabilitation, Fourth Amendment Motions to Dismiss and Suppress.

Appellate Experience: Both Appellate Court and Supreme Court briefs, appellate argument.

Other: Residential real estate, wills contracts for corporation, incorporations, subdivisions and municipal law.

CBA Executive Committee, Family Law
CBA Executive Committee on Women in Law

Accomplishments: Skillful negotiator, have earned the respect of judiciary. Recognized as and expert researcher and brief writer. Pro Bono Award, Connecticut Trial Lawyers Association 1992, 1993, 1994. Chair, People's Law School, 1997-2001.

EXPERIENCE

2002 - Present Superior Court Judge, State of Connecticut

²⁰⁰²
2000 - ~~Present~~ Jacobs Partners, Norwalk, Connecticut. Litigation

1998 - 2000 Ury and Moskow, Westport, Connecticut Complex litigation management involving PI, medical malpractice, trial and appellate work.

1989 - 1998 Private Litigation Practice, Westport and Fairfield, CT. Personal injury, negligence, malpractice, commercial litigation. Jury trial experience. Considerable appellate practice.

1987 - 1989 Partner, Perry & McKendry, Wilton, CT. Responsible for all litigation in a small law firm. Real estate, subdivision, zoning variances, zoning appeals, corporations and incorporations.

- 1984 - 1987 Associate, Lovejoy, Hefferan, Rimer & Cuneo, Wilton, CT.
Litigation associate, Assistant Municipal Attorney for Towns of
Wilton and New Canaan, Connecticut.
- 1983 - 1984 Associate, Bieliezna, Papazaglou, Frizzelli, & Sjovall, Danbury, CT.
Litigation Associate, insurance defense work, AETNA; plaintiff's
attorney. All aspects of civil and criminal litigation from initial client
interview to preparation for trial, trial; appellate briefs and argument.
- 1981 - 1983 Associate, Law Offices of Joseph M. Brophy, Westport, CT.
Litigation Associate for sole practitioner. Extensive motion
arguments brief writing, civil, criminal and appellate jury trial
experience.
- 1980 - 1981 Law Clerk and Supervisor, Connecticut Superior Courts. Worked
with Judges Howard J. Moraghan, T. Clark Hull, Margaret Driscoll,
William Sullivan, G. Sarsfield Ford, Robert Levister, Stanley
Novack, William Dannehy, Sidney Landau, Robert Callahan.

Supervisor, Law Clerks - In charge of Stamford-Norwalk and
Danbury Judicial Districts. Coordinated all judicial research and trial
requests. Supervised five attorneys and was responsible for the legal
and written accuracy of their briefs.

Accomplishments, Within five months of tenure, was promoted to
supervisor as well as law clerk in charge of two Judicial districts. Developed
expertise in statutory construction. Was the liaison between staff and judiciary.

EDUCATION:

Pace University School of Law, White Plains, New York 10603. J.D. June, 1980.
Top 15% of class.

Honors: Law Review, invitation based on Academic Record;
Selection by writing competition. Resigned due to pregnancy.

Fairfield University, Fairfield, Connecticut 06430. M.A. June 1976, Major,
American Studies, Literature

Honors: Graduated with Highest Honors, Written and Oral Distinction,
Academic Fellowship.

Stonehill College, North Easton, Massachusetts 02356. B.A. June 1970,
Major: English

Honors: Cum Laude, Academic Scholarship, State of Connecticut

Scholar, Woodrow Wilson Nominee, elected Delta Epsilon Sigma,
National Catholic College Honor Society, Who's Who in American Colleges
And Universities.

REFERENCES:

Hon. Stanley Novack, Stamford/Norwalk JD, 123 Hoyt Street, Stamford, CT. 06905

~~Hon. Lynda Munko~~, Middletown JD, NCourt Street, Middletown, CT 06457

Hon. Mark Taylor, Administrative Judge, Waterbury Judicial District,
300 grand st, Waterbury, CT 203-591-3340

SCHOFIELD, HON. MARYLOUISE

May 8, 2002	-	Litchfield Judicial District, G.A. 18 Bantam
Sept. 2, 2002	-	Litchfield Judicial District
Sept. 1, 2003	-	Danbury Courthouse for Juvenile Matters and Stamford Courthouse for Juvenile Matters (P.J. for both)
Aug. 30, 2004	-	Stamford-Norwalk Judicial District
May 23, 2005	-	Stamford-Norwalk Judicial District
Sept. 5, 2005	-	Stamford-Norwalk Judicial District P.J. for Family Division
Sept. 4, 2006	-	Stamford Judicial District and G.A. 1 Courthouse Family Division Parts S and D; Civil Division except Part H; Criminal Division
Sept. 3, 2007	-	Stamford Judicial District and G.A. 1 Courthouse Family Division Parts S and D; Civil Division except Part H; Criminal Division
Sept. 1, 2008	-	Stamford Judicial District and G.A. 1 Courthouse Family Division Parts S and D; Civil Division except Part H; Criminal Division A.A.J. and P.J. for Family Division
Aug. 31, 2009	-	Stamford Judicial District and G.A. 1 Courthouse Family Division Parts S and D; Civil Division except Part H; Criminal Division Assistant Administrative Judge P.J. for Family Division
Aug. 30, 2010	-	Danbury Judicial District Courthouse Family Division Parts S and D; Civil Division; Criminal Division P.J. for Civil Division
Sept. 5, 2011	-	Stamford Judicial District and G.A. 1 Courthouse Family Division Parts S and D; Civil Division except Part H; Criminal Division
Sept. 3, 2012	-	Stamford Judicial District and G.A. 1 Courthouse Family Division Parts S and D; Civil Division except Part H; Criminal Division
Sept. 2, 2013	-	Stamford Judicial District and G.A. 1 Courthouse Family Division Parts S and D; Civil Division except Part H; Criminal Division

J. Schofield

Page 2.

Reassigned prior to commencement of assignment in Stamford

Sept. 2, 2013	-	New Haven Judicial District Courthouse Family Matters
May 22, 2014	-	Waterbury Judicial District Courthouse
Sept. 1, 2014	-	Waterbury Judicial District Courthouse
Sept. 7, 2015	-	Waterbury Judicial District Courthouse
Dec. 16, 2015	-	Senior Judge
Sept. 5, 2016	-	Waterbury Judicial District Courthouse

Attorneys appearing frequently before me.

Mònica

From: Marylouise Black [schof12002@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 9:34 AM
To: monica4@tampabay.rr.com
Subject: Fw: Attorney's Addresses

On Wednesday, January 18, 2017 2:48 PM, "Caisse, Sandra" <Sandra.Caisse@jud.ct.gov> wrote:

Hi Judge:

Bob asked me to e-mail you the following addresses:

Sean Fitzmaurice
59 Central Ave.
Waterbury, CT 06702

Michael Fasano, Sr.
47 Sherman Hill Rd.
Suite B-103
Woodbury, CT 06798

Rosemary Guiliano
39 Sherman Hill Rd.
Suite 203
Woodbury, CT 06798

Bruce Diamond
365 Highland Ave.
Suite 102
Cheshire, CT 06410

Jeff Ginsberg
11 Bank St.
P.O. Box 1
Seymour, CT 06483

Hope the weather is nice and warm there and that you are enjoying your time off.

Sandie

Sandra C. Caisse
Administrative Judge's Secretary
Judicial District of Waterbury
300 Grand St.
Waterbury, CT 06702
(203) 591-3340
(203) 596-4488 –Fax
e-mail: Sandra.Caisse@jud.ct.gov



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
JUDICIAL BRANCH

SUPERIOR COURT OPERATIONS

JUDGE SUPPORT SERVICES

Legal Research

1061 Main Street
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604
Email: geoffrey.beckman@jud.ct.gov
203-579-7222 Fax 203-579-7294

TO: Judge Schofield

FROM: Geoffrey M. Beckman, Research Attorney

SUBJECT: Appeal Record

DATE: January 23, 2017

Accompanying this memorandum are two documents containing the information that you requested on your appeals since your last appointment. One document (Westlaw list) is a list generated from Westlaw by searching for your name in the "synopsis/digest" portion of the appellate decisions. For each case in which one of your decisions was at issue on appeal, I have pasted in relevant language from the case that appears to define the issue on appeal and the outcome. I have changed the font of the key words showing the outcome of the appeal (e.g., affirmed, reversed) to bold font.

The second document (AC Report) is a slightly edited version of a report that our office obtained from the Office of the Appellate Clerk. That report includes, among other things, pending appeals. The information on that report does not include the issues on appeal. The AC Report also includes many appeals that do not appear to involve a challenge to any of your decisions. The reason for this, based on communications that I have had with staff at the Office of the Appellate Clerk, is that their report includes any case in which the requesting judge had any involvement, whether or not that judge rendered the decision at issue in the appeal. I have indicated those cases by placing the notation "N/A" in the disposition method column for any decision for which an opinion was issued. For those cases that appear on both the AC Report and the Westlaw list, I have provided the official citation under the word "Opinion" in that column.

The cases on the AC Report that are listed as "Disposed" in the "Case Status" column, and for which the term "Opinion" does not appear in the "Disposition Method" column, were disposed of prior to argument by motion of a party or the court. Therefore, those cases do not appear on the Westlaw list. For those cases, I have no practical way to verify whether the issues on appeal pertained to any decision by you.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance.

1. LaFrance v. Lodmell, Supreme Court of Connecticut, SC 19614, SC 19615, 322 Conn. 828, 144 A.3d 373, September 6, 2016.

This consolidated appeal arises from a marital dissolution action brought by the plaintiff, Joan LaFrance, against the defendant, Dean W. Lodmell. On appeal, the defendant asserts that the trial court improperly: (1) applied General Statutes § 46b–66 (c) to an agreement to arbitrate contained within a prenuptial agreement between the parties and limited arbitration to the sale of a jointly owned residential property (residence); (2) denied the defendant's request for leave to file an amended cross complaint to assert certain claims against the plaintiff in the dissolution action; and (3) confirmed the arbitration awards where the arbitrator exceeded the scope of her authority and the scope of the submission. We reject the defendant's claims and **affirm** the judgment of the trial court.

1. Malpeso v. Malpeso, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 37203, AC 36622, 165 Conn.App. 151, 138 A.3d 1069, May 03, 2016.

In this postdissolution marital matter, the defendant, Pasquale Malpeso, appeals from the judgment of the trial court. Although the court granted his motion to modify the original unallocated alimony and child support that was entered as part of the parties' judgment of dissolution, the defendant contends that the court (1) applied the wrong legal standard in calculating the child support component of the unallocated alimony and child support order, (2) determined the wrong effective date of the modification, (3) erroneously concluded that a lien could be placed on the defendant's assets for him to pay his alimony obligation, and (4) incorrectly stated that it lacked jurisdiction to terminate his obligation to pay alimony. The defendant further claims that the trial court abused its discretion in finding him in contempt and ordering him to pay the plaintiff's counsel fees and costs. We **reverse, in part, and affirm, in part**, the judgment of the trial court.

2. Forgione v. Forgione, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 36991, 162 Conn.App. 1, 129 A.3d 766, December 22, 2015.

In this case, nearly three and one-half years after a judgment of dissolution, the parties entered into a stipulation in which they agreed to permit the trial court to open the dissolution judgment for the limited purpose of resolving "all issues of a financial nature, including the division of assets, alimony and support, and liabilities, but not as to custody or parenting." Pursuant to that stipulation, the trial court opened the judgment and reissued financial orders. The defendant, Mennato Forgione, appeals from the judgment of the trial court reissuing those financial orders. We conclude that the trial court was without subject matter jurisdiction to open the judgment as to the division of the parties' assets in the absence of a finding or concession of fraud. Accordingly, we **vacate the judgment and remand** the matter with direction to restore to the docket the motion to open filed by the plaintiff, Beatrice Forgione.

3. Hane v. Hane, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 36475, 158 Conn.App. 167, 118 A.3d 685, June 30, 2015.

The plaintiff, Madelaine Hane, appeals from the postdissolution judgment of the trial court denying retroactive application of the order granting her motion to modify alimony and child support payable to her by the defendant, Owen Hane. On appeal, the plaintiff claims that the court abused its discretion by not ordering that the June 5, 2013 order increasing the alimony and child support be applied retroactively to July 11, 2011, the date her motion was served on the defendant. We **affirm** the judgment of the trial court.

4. Light v. Grimes, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 35905, 156 Conn.App. 53, 111 A.3d 551, March 17, 2015.

Note: Appeal is from decisions of another trial court judge, *Emons, J.*, on various postjudgment motions. Judge Schofield rendered the underlying judgment that was not the subject of this appeal.

5. Three Levels Corp. v. Conservation Com'n of Town of Redding, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 34298, 148 Conn.App. 91, 89 A.3d 3, February 11, 2014.

The defendant, the Conservation Commission of the Town of Redding (commission), appeals from the judgment of the Superior Court sustaining the appeal of the plaintiff Three Levels Corporation from its decision to deny the plaintiff's application for a license to conduct regulated activities pursuant to the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Act (act), General Statutes § 22a-36 et seq. The commission's principal contention is that the court improperly sustained the appeal because substantial evidence in the record supports its findings that (1) the proposed activities presented a significant adverse environmental impact on the Saugatuck River and its associated wetlands system, and (2) the plaintiff's application was incomplete due to the plaintiff's failure to submit adequate information on the impact of the proposed activities on the river and wetlands. The commission further claims that the court improperly intimated that the commission lacked jurisdiction to regulate stormwater impacts on wetlands and watercourses due to a lack of regulations thereon. We **affirm in part and reverse in part** the judgment of the Superior Court.

6. Candlewood Hills Tax Dist. v. Medina, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 33564, 143 Conn.App. 230, 74 A.3d 421, June 11, 2013.

The defendants, former board members and residents of the plaintiff, Candlewood Hills Tax District, appeal from the judgment of the trial court declaring invalid actions taken by the defendants to reduce the boundaries of the district containing the defendants' property. The defendants claim that (1) the court improperly declared the boundary reduction invalid despite finding compliance with the statutory procedure, and (2) the court erroneously found that the defendants owed fiduciary duties to the district and breached these duties by calling the referendum on the boundary reduction. We **reverse** the judgment of the trial court.

7. Zitkene v. Zitkus, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 33913, 140 Conn.App. 856, 60 A.3d 322, February 19, 2013.

Distilled to its essence, this case involves the question of whether the courts of this state should recognize a judgment of dissolution rendered in the Republic of Lithuania in 2009. The plaintiff, Birute Zitkene, appeals from the judgment of the trial court granting the motion of the defendant, Romualdas Zitkus, to dismiss her dissolution action. The plaintiff claims that the court improperly concluded that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction. We **affirm** the judgment of the trial court.

8. Morgan v. Morgan, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 29877, 136 Conn.App. 371, 46 A.3d 255, June 26, 2012.

The plaintiff, John Adams Morgan, appeals from the judgment of dissolution rendered by the trial court. We **dismiss** the appeal for lack of a final judgment.

The judgment of dissolution provided that, pursuant to the parties' postnuptial agreement, the plaintiff owed the defendant . . . alimony and child support, commencing the first of the month after the dissolution action was filed. The court ordered that the sum would "accrue with statutory interest from the date the monthly payments were due" but did not specify a rate of interest. The plaintiff appealed from the judgment of dissolution. The defendant filed a motion to clarify the judgment and thereafter filed a motion to open the judgment. On July 28, 2009, the court issued a memorandum of decision clarifying various orders and opening the judgment for two limited purposes: (1) to calculate the arrearage owed that had accrued since the close of evidence and (2) to clarify, in an evidentiary hearing, the best way to provide security for child support upon the death of the plaintiff. The plaintiff filed an amended appeal, challenging the dissolution judgment and the July 28, 2009 ruling.

We conclude, and the parties agreed at oral argument before this court, that the appeal was not taken from a final judgment. Although the judgment of dissolution included an award of prejudgment interest, the court did not establish the applicable rate of interest. . . . Accordingly, we conclude that the appeal in the present case must be **dismissed** for lack of a final judgment.

9. Light v. Grimes, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 32065, 136 Conn.App. 161, 43 A.3d 808, June 05, 2012.

In this marital dissolution appeal, we must determine the effect on certain orders issued in a dissolution decree when a motion for reconsideration of other orders associated with that decree is filed. The defendant, David Grimes, claims that the trial court erred in holding that the parties' marital assets must be valued as of the date on which the dissolution decree was entered. Specifically, the defendant argues that, even though both he and the plaintiff, Libby Light, moved for clarification of the court's order dividing their assets, without seeking reconsideration of that order, the judgment and all orders associated therewith did not become final or effective until a decision was rendered on his motion for reconsideration of other unrelated financial orders, and thus that the date on which the court ruled on the motion for reconsideration constituted the actual date of judgment in this case. The defendant thus contends that the proper date of valuation of the parties' marital assets is the date on which the court ruled on his motion for reconsideration. We disagree and, accordingly, **affirm** the judgment of the trial court.

10. *Curtis v. Curtis*, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 32983, 134 Conn.App. 833, 41 A.3d 318, April 17, 2012.

The defendant, David L. Curtis, appeals from the judgment of the trial court, rendered following a hearing on a motion for contempt, ordering him to reimburse the plaintiff, Theresa N. Curtis, now known as Theresa N. Flatley, for a portion of certain child care expenses. The defendant claims that the court (1) violated his right to procedural due process by not allowing him to call the plaintiff as a witness, (2) improperly ordered reimbursement of the child care expenses because the plaintiff failed to establish that those expenses met the criteria set forth in § 46b-215a-2b of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies and (3) improperly failed to apply the doctrine of unclean hands. We **affirm** the judgment of the trial court.

11. *Nowacki v. Nowacki*, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 32327, 129 Conn.App. 157, 20 A.3d 702, May 31, 2011.

On appeal, the defendant challenged (1) court's determination that he was not competent to represent himself, (2) an order to produce a financial affidavit, (3) the propriety of a hearing that occurred prior to a decision on his motion to restore his right to self-representation and while his appeal of an earlier order was pending, (4) an allocation of attorney's fees, and (5) the court's denial of his motion for mistrial.

The defendant's initial appeal and that portion of his third amended appeal addressing his right to represent himself are **dismissed** as moot. The decisions of the trial court with respect to the remaining appellate claims are **affirmed**.

Note: Appeal pertained to decisions of *Tierney*, *Schofield*, and *Malone, JJ.*

12. *Stechel v. Foster*, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 30985, 125 Conn.App. 441, 8 A.3d 545, December 07, 2010.

The defendant in this postjudgment marital dissolution matter, Patricia Lynn Foster, appeals from the judgment of the trial court ordering her to transfer to the plaintiff, Ira B. Stechel, funds from her interest in a defined benefit pension plan (pension plan). On appeal, the defendant claims that the court's order was improper because (1) it constituted a post-judgment modification of the parties' agreement regarding the equitable division of the marital estate and (2) the court entered the order without holding an evidentiary hearing. We **reverse in part** the judgment of the trial court.

13. *Zahringer v. Zahringer*, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 31056, 124 Conn.App. 672, 6 A.3d 141, November 02, 2010.

The defendant, George J. Zahringer III, appeals from the judgment of the trial court modifying the unallocated alimony and child support awarded to the plaintiff, Celia Zahringer, at the time of the dissolution of the marriage of the parties. The defendant claims that the court erred by (1) finding that payments from the plaintiff's father, Eugene Goldberg, were loans, (2) not taking these payments into

account, regardless of whether or not they were loans, in fashioning its order for unallocated alimony and child support, (3) incorporating the defendant's capital accumulation plan (CAP) distribution into the determination of the plaintiff's alimony award, and (4) employing the dates of the 1999 hearing on the plaintiff's motion for modification of alimony and child support and the parties' gross income in fashioning its financial orders. We agree that the court erred in employing the dates of the 1999 hearing and accordingly **reverse** the judgment of the trial court.

14. Parrotta v. Parrotta, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 31085, 119 Conn.App. 472, 988 A.2d 383, February 23, 2010.

In this marital dissolution case, the plaintiff, Lorraine Parrotta, appeals from the order of the trial court lifting, in part, the automatic orders that apply to all dissolution cases and allowing the defendant, Michael Parrotta, to expend \$100,000 for attorney's fees to defend himself in a criminal matter involving an alleged assault on the plaintiff. Because we conclude that the order in question is not an appealable final judgment, we **dismiss** the appeal.

15. Farkas v. Farkas, Appellate Court of Connecticut, AC 30075, 118 Conn.App. 827, 986 A.2d 300, January 12, 2010.

The defendant, Sandor Farkas, appeals from a dissolution of marriage judgment rendered by the trial court. On appeal, the defendant claims that the court made incorrect factual determinations that the plaintiff, Lisa A. Farkas, was unable to work and that the status of his physical ailments remain unresolved. The defendant also claims that the court's property allocation and financial awards were unreasonable in light of the evidence presented at trial. We **affirm** the judgment of the trial court.

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

Docket No	Case Name	Case Filed	Case Status	Argued Submitted Date	Disposition Dt	Disp Method	Disp No1	Disp No2
AC 39682	<u>CHRISTINE OSTRAND v. WILLIAM OSTRAND</u>	10/4/2016	Disposed		12/14/2016	Party Motion		
AC 39448	<u>PAUL GREENAN v. SUZANNE GREENAN</u>	7/25/2016	Disposed		12/7/2016	Withdrawn		
AC 39409	<u>GARY KUNSCHAFT v. DENISE KUNSCHAFT</u>	7/14/2016	Disposed		8/17/2016	NISI Disposition		
AC 39041	<u>CHARLES ILL v. ELLEN MANZO-ILL</u>	3/28/2016	Disposed		10/19/2016	Party Motion		
AC 38921	<u>JOHN A. MOUNTAIN v. HEIDI L. MOUNTAIN</u>	2/22/2016	Disposed		6/2/2016	Withdrawn		
AC 38828	<u>KAREN ZILKHA v. DAVID ZILKHA</u>	1/26/2016	Disposed		2/3/2016	Withdrawn		
AC 38768	<u>ELIZABETH MILBAUER v. DAVID L. MILBAUER</u>	1/12/2016	Disposed		7/27/2016	Withdrawn		
AC 38483	<u>DAWN THOMPSON v. EDWARD THOMPSON</u>	10/14/2015	Disposed		8/16/2016	NISI Disposition		
AC 38388	<u>FELICIA PIEROT BRODY v. CARY BRODY</u>	9/16/2015	Disposed		5/10/2016	Withdrawn – Settlement Program		
AC 38352	<u>ANNE A. ESSE v. TODD W. ESSE</u>	9/8/2015	Disposed		3/18/2016	Withdrawn		
AC 38187	<u>KAREN ZILKHA v. DAVID ZILKHA</u>	7/17/2015	Disposed		1/7/2016	Withdrawn		
AC 38040	KARINA	6/8/2015	Disnosed		9/1/2015	NISI		

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

							Disposition
	<u>AC 38034</u>	<u>ANGELA GIZZI v.</u> <u>ANGELO GIZZI</u>	6/12/2015	Disposed		7/13/2015	Withdrawn
	<u>AC 38008</u>	<u>KAREN ZILKHA v.</u> <u>DAVID ZILKHA</u>	5/29/2015	Disposed		1/7/2016	Withdrawn
	<u>AC 38007</u>	<u>KAREN ZILKHA v.</u> <u>DAVID ZILKHA</u>	5/29/2015	Disposed	5/11/2016	8/9/2016	Opinion N/A Affirmed
	<u>AC 38006</u>	<u>KAREN ZILKHA v.</u> <u>DAVID ZILKHA</u>	5/29/2015	Disposed	5/11/2016	8/9/2016	Opinion N/A Affirmed
	<u>AC 37949</u>	<u>TARA CARTER v.</u> <u>ANDREW CARTER</u>	5/18/2015	Disposed		7/6/2015	Withdrawn
	<u>AC 37798</u>	<u>ELIZABETH</u> <u>MILBAUER v.</u> <u>DAVID MILBAUER</u>	3/26/2015	Disposed		5/9/2016	Withdrawn – Settlement Program
	<u>AC 37776</u>	<u>CCT</u> <u>COMMUNICATIONS</u> <u>INC. v. ZONE</u> <u>TELECOM INC.</u> <u>N/K/A ANPI</u> <u>BUSINESS, LLC</u>	3/12/2015	Disposed		10/21/2015	Court Motion
	<u>AC</u> <u>37776A01</u>	<u>CCT</u> <u>COMMUNICATIONS</u> <u>INC. v. ZONE</u> <u>TELECOM INC.</u> <u>N/K/A ANPI</u> <u>BUSINESS, LLC</u>	5/4/2015	Disposed		11/3/2015	Transferred
	<u>AC 37750</u>	<u>NELSON PENA v.</u> <u>LAURA</u> <u>GLADSTONE</u>	3/11/2015	Disposed	5/18/2016	9/13/2016	Opinion N/A Affirmed
	<u>AC 37660</u>	<u>SAVERIO A.</u> <u>SORRENTINO v.</u> <u>KATHRYN M.</u> <u>SORRENTINO</u>	2/5/2015	Disposed	1/30/2017	4/1/2015	NISI Disposition

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>AC 37655</u>	<u>JOAN LAFRANCE v.</u> <u>DEAN W. LODMELL</u>	2/3/2015	Disposed/Transfer		1/7/2016	Transferred	
<u>AC 37619</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	1/12/2015	Disposed	2/11/2016	3/8/2016	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 37618</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	1/12/2015	Disposed	2/11/2016	3/8/2016	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 37617</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	1/12/2015	Disposed	2/11/2016	3/8/2016	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 37616</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	1/12/2015	Disposed	2/11/2016	3/8/2016	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 37615</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	1/16/2015	Disposed	2/11/2016	3/8/2016	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 37614</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	1/16/2015	Disposed	2/11/2016	3/8/2016	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 37545</u>	<u>CHELSEA</u> <u>CHAPMAN KIRWAN</u> <u>v. LAURENCE</u> <u>KIRWAN</u>	1/12/2015	Disposed		3/16/2015	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 37538</u>	<u>ANDA WEYHER v.</u> <u>HARRY F. WEYHER</u> <u>III</u>	1/5/2015	Disposed	1/19/2016	4/19/2016	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 37479</u>	<u>NELSON PENA v.</u> <u>LAURA</u> <u>GLADSTONE</u>	12/9/2014	Disposed	5/18/2016	9/13/2016	Opinion N/A	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 37454</u>	<u>JOSEPH BATCHA</u> <u>III v. KELLY</u> <u>BATCHA</u>	12/12/2014	Disposed		8/24/2015	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 37413</u>	<u>VIVIAN GAGLIANO</u>	11/14/2014	Disposed	4/12/2016	8/30/2016	Opinion	Reversed in

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

	<u>ET AL. v.</u> <u>ADVANCED</u> <u>SPECIALTY CARE</u> <u>PC D/B/A</u> <u>ADVANCED</u> <u>SURGICAL CARE</u> <u>ET AL.</u>					N/A	Part; Judgment Directed
<u>AC 37333</u>	<u>RUSLAN</u> <u>USMANOV v.</u> <u>KATSIARYNA</u> <u>HRAMOVICH</u>	10/2/2014	Disposed		10/29/2014	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 37309</u>	<u>MARY MCTIERNAN</u> <u>v. BARRY</u> <u>MCTIERNAN</u>	10/17/2014	Disposed	1/20/2016	4/14/2016	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 37250</u>	<u>EBELE OGUAGHA</u> <u>v. FELIX OGUAGHA</u>	9/30/2014	Disposed		12/30/2014	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 37203</u>	<u>CHARLOTTE</u> <u>MALPESO v.</u> <u>PASQUALE</u> <u>MALPESO</u>	9/16/2014	Disposed	12/14/2015	5/3/2016	Opinion 165 Conn.App. 151	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 37170</u>	<u>ELIZABETH A.</u> <u>GAARY v. PATRICK</u> <u>J. GILLIS</u>	9/9/2014	Disposed	10/26/2015	1/5/2016	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 37108</u>	<u>LIUDMIL K.</u> <u>PETROV v.</u> <u>NATALIYA</u> <u>GUEORGUEVA</u>	8/15/2014	Disposed	12/3/2015	8/9/2016	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 37070</u>	<u>CHARLES ILL v.</u> <u>ELLEN MANZO-ILL</u>	8/7/2014	Disposed	4/14/2016	7/12/2016	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 36995</u>	<u>MELINDA YOUNG</u> <u>v. KENNETH</u> <u>YOUNG</u>	7/3/2014	Disposed		2/26/2015	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 36991</u>	<u>BEATRICE</u> <u>FORGIONE v.</u> <u>MENNATO</u> <u>FORGIONE</u>	7/7/2014	Disposed	10/8/2015	12/22/2015	Opinion 162 Conn.App. 1	Remanded

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>AC 36976</u>	<u>MAXIMILLIAN D. BREIER v. LYNNETTE BREIER</u>	6/23/2014	Disposed	2/2/2015	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 36968</u>	<u>GREGORY MESNIAEFF v. ELIZABETH BURKE</u>	6/25/2014	Disposed	3/31/2015	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 36959</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v. LISA WHITNUM-BAKER</u>	6/3/2014	Disposed	9/18/2015 8/12/2014	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 36959</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v. LISA WHITNUM-BAKER</u>	6/3/2014	Disposed	9/18/2015 11/10/2015	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 36958</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v. LISA WHITNUM-BAKER</u>	6/3/2014	Disposed	9/18/2015 8/12/2014	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 36958</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v. LISA WHITNUM-BAKER</u>	6/3/2014	Disposed	9/18/2015 11/10/2015	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 36920</u>	<u>MARY STEWART v. JEFFREY STEWART</u>	6/4/2014	Disposed	2/19/2015 6/2/2015	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 36853</u>	<u>CAROL S. GORDON v. ALAN J. GORDON</u>	5/13/2014	Disposed	7/1/2014	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 36853</u>	<u>CAROL S. GORDON v. ALAN J. GORDON</u>	5/13/2014	Disposed	10/31/2014	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 36842</u>	<u>MARIANNA ANTONUCCI v. VINCENT ANTONUCCI</u>	5/19/2014	Disposed	9/21/2015 3/29/2016	Opinion N/A	Other
<u>AC 36809</u>	<u>ROBERT MAKUCH v. GHADA KHALED</u>	5/6/2014	Disposed	6/16/2014	Withdrawn – Settlement Program	

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>AC 36728</u>	<u>SHANNON F. CARRIER v. JAMES CARRIER</u>	4/14/2014	Disposed		1/20/2015	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 36712</u>	<u>JOAN LAFRANCE v. DEAN W. LODMELL</u>	4/17/2014	Disposed/Transfer		1/7/2016	Transferred	
<u>AC 36691</u>	<u>MARJORIE HORNUNG v. ROBERT HORNUNG</u>	4/4/2014	Disposed/Transfer		8/5/2014	Transferred	
<u>AC 36673</u>	<u>RUTH F. PERRY v. STEPHEN C. PERRY</u>	3/24/2014	Disposed	2/10/2015	4/14/2015	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 36640</u>	<u>FELICIA PIEROT BRODY v. CARY BRODY</u>	10/24/2013	Disposed	9/18/2014	11/4/2014	Opinion N/A	Dismissed
<u>AC 36622</u>	<u>CHARLOTTE MALPESO v. PASQUALE MALPESO</u>	3/10/2014	Disposed	12/14/2015	5/3/2016	Opinion 165 Conn.App. 151	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 36622A01</u>	<u>CHARLOTTE MALPESO v. PASQUALE MALPESO</u>	9/16/2014	Disposed		5/3/2016	Opinion 165 Conn.App. 151	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 36617</u>	<u>JILL GILBERT CALLAHAN v. JAMES CALLAHAN</u>	3/7/2014	Disposed	12/10/2014	5/5/2015	Opinion N/A	Reversed in Part; Judgment Directed
<u>AC 36610</u>	<u>GAIL C. CERICK v. RICHARD M. CERICK</u>	3/6/2014	Disposed		5/11/2015	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 36551</u>	<u>LAUREN BERGER v. BRYAN FINKEL</u>	2/11/2014	Disposed	9/18/2015	11/17/2015	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 36499</u>	<u>KAREN ZILKHA v. DAVID ZILKHA</u>	1/22/2014	Disposed	3/9/2015	8/11/2015	Opinion N/A	Other

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

AC 36475	<u>MADELAINE HANE v. OWEN HANE</u>	1/21/2014	Disposed	3/12/2015	6/30/2015	Opinion 158 Conn.App. 167	Affirmed
AC 36415	<u>KENNETH CLARK v. MARY ANN CLARK</u>	12/27/2013	Disposed	10/23/2014	11/11/2014	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
AC 36396	<u>SAVERIO A. SORRENTINO v. KATHRYN M. SORRENTINO</u>	12/24/2013	Disposed	4/21/2015	9/22/2015	Opinion N/A	Other
AC 36386	<u>CYNTHIA BAINER v. TODD BAINER</u>	12/2/2013	Disposed		4/21/2014	NISI Disposition	
AC 36348	<u>RICHARD P. GABRIEL v. DIANA K. GABRIEL</u>	11/25/2013	Disposed	5/21/2015	9/15/2015	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Further Proceedings
AC 36339	<u>MARGARET MCGUINNESS v. JOHN J. MCGUINNESS</u>	12/6/2013	Disposed	12/8/2014	2/3/2015	Opinion N/A	Dismissed
AC 36307	<u>CURTIS WOOD v. DEBORAH WOOD</u>	11/19/2013	Disposed	5/26/2015	10/27/2015	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
AC 36276	<u>SIMONA CASARINI BARCELO v. DANIEL BARCELO</u>	11/19/2013	Disposed	1/21/2015	6/30/2015	Opinion N/A	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings
AC 36241	<u>RICHARD BARBOUR v. MARIE BARBOUR</u>	11/1/2013	Disposed	12/11/2014	4/7/2015	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Further Proceedings
AC 36210	<u>GAIL REINKE v. WALTER SING</u>	10/16/2013	Disposed	4/9/2015	2/2/2016	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Judgment Directed
AC 36210A01	<u>GAIL REINKE v. WALTER SING</u>	8/13/2015	Disposed		2/2/2016	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Judgment Directed

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>AC 36138</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	9/27/2013	Disposed	2/11/2014	Court Motion	
<u>AC 36137</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	9/30/2013	Disposed	11/18/2013	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 36136</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	9/30/2013	Disposed	2/11/2014	Court Motion	
<u>AC 36135</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	9/30/2013	Disposed	11/18/2013	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 36134</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	9/27/2013	Disposed	11/18/2013	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 36133</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	9/27/2013	Disposed	2/11/2014	Court Motion	
<u>AC 36132</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	9/27/2013	Disposed	11/19/2013	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 36131</u>	<u>JAMES J. BAKER v.</u> <u>LISA WHITNUM-</u> <u>BAKER</u>	9/27/2013	Disposed	2/11/2014	Court Motion	
<u>AC 35927</u>	<u>JULAIN APOLLON</u> <u>v. FRANCIOS</u> <u>APOLLON</u>	5/1/2013	Disposed	9/16/2013	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 35910</u>	<u>EDWARD J.</u> <u>O'HARA v. JANE</u> <u>MACKIE O'HARA</u>	7/29/2013	Disposed	10/16/2013	Party Motion	
<u>AC 35905</u>	<u>LIBBY LIGHT v.</u> <u>DAVID GRIMES</u>	7/26/2013	Disposed	10/20/2014 3/17/2015	Opinion 156 Conn.App. 53	Reversed; Judgment Directed
<u>AC 35900</u>	<u>JOHN L. REGAN v.</u>	8/20/2013	Disposed/Transfer	10/10/2013	Transferred	

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

	<u>SIOBHAN B. REGAN</u>								
<u>AC 35781</u>	<u>KAREN ZILKHA v. DAVID ZILKHA</u>	6/20/2013	Disposed		10/16/2013	Court Motion			
<u>AC 35707</u>	<u>LISA BRUNO v. REED WHIPPLE ET AL.</u>	5/24/2013	Disposed	9/16/2015	12/29/2015	Opinion N/A		– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings	
<u>AC 35693</u>	<u>JOANNE P. DAVERSA v. MICHAEL DAVERSA</u>	5/22/2013	Disposed		12/5/2014	Withdrawn			
<u>AC 35668</u>	<u>BASIL A. PANAGOPULOS v. MARTINE PANAGOPULOS</u>	5/9/2013	Disposed		9/10/2013	NISI Disposition			
<u>AC 35668</u>	<u>BASIL A. PANAGOPULOS v. MARTINE PANAGOPULOS</u>	5/9/2013	Disposed		12/27/2013	NISI Disposition			
<u>AC 35648</u>	<u>EDWARD J. O'HARA v. JANE M. MACKIE</u>	5/3/2013	Disposed	4/8/2014	7/8/2014	Opinion N/A	Affirmed		
<u>AC 35614</u>	<u>BETTINA HEGEL TONGHINI v. ERIC A. TONGHINI</u>	4/25/2013	Disposed	5/29/2014	8/12/2014	Opinion N/A	Affirmed		
<u>AC 35550</u>	<u>MILDRED R. HORNBLOWER v. JOHN G. HORNBLOWER</u>	4/8/2013	Disposed	3/19/2014	7/1/2014	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Further Proceedings		
<u>AC 35543</u>	<u>KENNETH CLARK v. MARY ANN CLARK</u>	4/5/2013	Disposed	1/22/2014	5/27/2014	Opinion N/A	Affirmed		
<u>AC 35529</u>	<u>JOSEPH M. DOYLE v. MEGHAN M. DOYLE</u>	4/2/2013	Disposed	3/17/2014	5/20/2014	Opinion N/A	Affirmed		

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>AC 35477</u>	<u>VALERIE O'HALPIN</u> <u>v. JAMES O'HALPIN</u>	3/4/2013	Disposed		4/30/2013	Withdrawn		
<u>AC 35457</u>	<u>ELIZABETH A.</u> <u>GAARY v. PATRICK</u> <u>J. GILLIS</u>	3/4/2013	Disposed		12/18/2013	NISI Disposition		
<u>AC</u> <u>35457A01</u>	<u>ELIZABETH A.</u> <u>GAARY v. PATRICK</u> <u>J. GILLIS</u>	4/1/2013	Disposed		12/18/2013	NISI Disposition		
<u>AC</u> <u>35457A02</u>	<u>ELIZABETH A.</u> <u>GAARY v. PATRICK</u> <u>J. GILLIS</u>	4/5/2013	Disposed		12/18/2013	NISI Disposition		
<u>AC 35447</u>	<u>SAVERIO</u> <u>SORRENTINO v.</u> <u>KATHRYN M.</u> <u>SORRENTINO</u>	2/28/2013	Disposed		10/23/2013	Withdrawn		
<u>AC 35440</u>	<u>BRIAN YOMTOV v.</u> <u>SALLY YOMTOV</u>	2/19/2013	Disposed	5/28/2014	8/19/2014	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Judgment Directed	Reversed; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 35395</u>	<u>GREGORY</u> <u>MESNIAEFF v.</u> <u>ELIZABETH BURKE</u>	2/5/2013	Disposed		2/21/2013	Withdrawn		
<u>AC 35384</u>	<u>SUZANNE</u> <u>NOWACKI v.</u> <u>MICHAEL</u> <u>NOWACKI</u>	1/28/2013	Disposed		12/26/2013	NISI Disposition		
<u>AC 35382</u>	<u>CATHERINE</u> <u>LEDERLE v.</u> <u>STEVAN SPIVEY</u>	1/31/2013	Disposed	5/19/2014	7/29/2014	Opinion N/A	Affirmed	
<u>AC 35381</u>	<u>SAVERIO</u> <u>SORRENTINO v.</u> <u>KATHRYN M.</u> <u>SORRENTINO</u>	1/25/2013	Disposed		4/3/2013	Withdrawn		
<u>AC 35375</u>	<u>MARIANNE</u> <u>HOWATSON v.</u> <u>RICHARD</u> <u>FRIEDBERG</u>	1/22/2013	Disposed		5/22/2013	Party Motion		

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>AC 35223</u>	<u>KATHY FAIRBANKS</u> <u>v. RICHARD</u> <u>FAIRBANKS</u>	11/27/2012	Disposed		1/2/2013	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 35219</u>	<u>TAMMY L. HARRIS</u> <u>v. TERRELL W.</u> <u>HARRIS</u>	12/3/2012	Disposed	5/22/2014	9/16/2014	Withdrawn	
<u>AC</u> <u>35219X01</u>	<u>TAMMY L. HARRIS</u> <u>v. TERRELL W.</u> <u>HARRIS</u>	12/11/2012	Argued/No Decision		11/25/2013	Withdrawn	
<u>AC</u> <u>35219A01</u>	<u>TAMMY L. HARRIS</u> <u>v. TERRELL W.</u> <u>HARRIS</u>	3/4/2013	Disposed		9/16/2014	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 35142</u>	<u>MARIE T.</u> <u>CIASULLO v. PAUL</u> <u>E. CIASULLO</u>	10/25/2012	Disposed		11/8/2012	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 35096</u>	<u>CAROLINE</u> <u>HIRSCHFELD v.</u> <u>ROBERT B.</u> <u>MACHINIST</u>	10/9/2012	Disposed	3/6/2014	7/8/2014	Opinion N/A	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 35061</u>	<u>JOAN CORONIS v.</u> <u>DEAN CORONIS</u>	9/28/2012	Disposed		3/4/2013	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 35032</u>	<u>JAMES W. TALBOT</u> <u>v. SHARON R.</u> <u>TALBOT</u>	9/12/2012	Disposed	11/19/2013	2/18/2014	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 34968</u>	<u>ELIZABETH A.</u> <u>GAARY v. PATRICK</u> <u>J. GILLIS</u>	8/31/2012	Disposed		2/4/2013	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 34951</u>	<u>JOSEPH GRASSO</u> <u>v. JOANNE</u> <u>GRASSO</u>	8/20/2012	Disposed	5/15/2014	9/30/2014	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 34940</u>	<u>SUSAN CUNNIFFE</u> <u>v. MARK CHARLES</u> <u>CUNNIFFE</u>	8/13/2012	Disposed	11/15/2013	5/27/2014	Opinion N/A	Dismissed
<u>AC 34936</u>	<u>JILL GILBERT</u> <u>CALLAHAN v.</u>	8/17/2012	Disposed	12/10/2014	5/5/2015	Opinion N/A	Affirmed

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

	<u>JAMES CALLAHAN</u>							
<u>AC 34912</u>	<u>MARIE T. CIASULLO v. PAUL E. CIASULLO</u>	8/8/2012	Disposed		12/10/2012	Withdrawn		
<u>AC 34849</u>	<u>TARA KUPERSMITH v. COREY KUPERSMITH</u>	7/17/2012	Disposed	5/28/2013	9/24/2013	Opinion N/A	Reversed in Part; Judgment Directed	
<u>AC 34815</u>	<u>GARVEY FOX v. MAUREEN FOX</u>	7/13/2012	Disposed	10/28/2013	12/10/2013	Opinion N/A	Affirmed	
<u>AC 34696</u>	<u>KENNETH CLARK v. MARY ANN CLARK</u>	6/1/2012	Disposed		2/26/2013	NISI Disposition		
<u>AC 34620</u>	<u>LAUREN BERGER v. BRYAN FINKEL</u>	5/8/2012	Disposed		7/13/2012	NISI Disposition		
<u>AC 34620</u>	<u>LAUREN BERGER v. BRYAN FINKEL</u>	5/8/2012	Disposed		7/8/2013	Withdrawn		
<u>AC 34588</u>	<u>SUSAN CUNNIFFE v. MARK C. CUNNIFFE</u>	5/16/2012	Disposed		7/25/2012	Party Motion		
<u>AC 34572</u>	<u>SUSAN E. SCHALLER v. JOHN F. SCHALLER</u>	4/30/2012	Disposed		5/30/2012	Withdrawn		
<u>AC 34536</u>	<u>JOHN REGAN v. SIOBHAN REGAN N/K/A SIOBHAN JONES</u>	4/16/2012	Disposed	3/4/2013	6/4/2013	Opinion N/A	Affirmed	
<u>AC 34503</u>	<u>JEFFREY HINGST v. HEATHER HINGST</u>	4/9/2012	Disposed		11/16/2012	Withdrawn – Settlement Program		
<u>AC 34485</u>	<u>VALERIE O'HALPIN v. JAMES O'HALPIN</u>	4/4/2012	Disposed	4/9/2013	8/6/2013	Opinion N/A	Affirmed	
<u>AC 34457</u>	<u>DOUGLAS H. STEVENS v. LYN M.</u>	3/30/2012	Disposed		7/20/2012	Withdrawn		

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

	<u>STEVENSON</u>								
<u>AC 34457A01</u>	<u>DOUGLAS H. STEVENSON v. LYN M. STEVENSON</u>	6/1/2012	Disposed	7/20/2012	Withdrawn				
<u>AC 34432</u>	<u>RUTH F. PERRY v. STEPHEN C. PERRY</u>	4/5/2012	Disposed/Transfer	6/29/2012	Transferred				
<u>AC 34388</u>	<u>PAUL GREENAN v. SUZANNE GREENAN</u>	3/9/2012	Disposed	11/5/2012	Party Motion				
<u>AC 34369</u>	<u>LISA LIND-LARSEN v. SPRAY PARCEL SIX PARTNERSHIP ET AL</u>	2/28/2012	Disposed	3/28/2012	Party Motion				
<u>AC 34364</u>	<u>MARGARITA OLIVA SAINZ DE AJA v. FERNANDO GABRIEL IRAZU</u>	2/24/2012	Disposed	10/12/2012 11/13/2012	Opinion N/A	Affirmed			
<u>AC 34320</u>	<u>PAUL GREENAN v. SUZANNE GREENAN</u>	2/7/2012	Disposed	12/9/2013 5/20/2014	Opinion N/A	Affirmed			
<u>AC 34313</u>	<u>LAURENCE D. BRUNSON v. DEBORAH A. BRUNSON</u>	2/7/2012	Disposed	12/18/2012	Withdrawn – Settlement Program				
<u>AC 34298</u>	<u>THREE LEVELS CORPORATION ET AL v. CONSERVATION COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF REDDING</u>	2/6/2012	Disposed	10/17/2013 2/11/2014	Opinion 148 Conn.App. 91	Reversed in Part; Judgment Directed			
<u>AC 34289</u>	<u>PATRICIA MISTHOPOULOS v. NOEL MISTHOPOULOS</u>	1/31/2012	Disposed	7/11/2012	Withdrawn				

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>AC 34247</u>	<u>LAKISHA CARPENTER SCHATZMAN v. MATTHEW A. SCHATZMAN</u>	1/23/2012	Disposed	11/26/2012	1/8/2013	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 34183</u>	<u>FELICIA PIEROT BRODY v. CARY BRODY</u>	12/29/2011	Disposed	5/16/2013	9/10/2013	Opinion N/A	Reversed in Part; Judgment Directed
<u>AC 34172</u>	<u>MICHELLE SAGALYN v. CHRISTOPHER PEDERSON</u>	12/22/2011	Disposed	12/3/2012	2/19/2013	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 34116</u>	<u>SARAH T. BOYLE v. ROGER BOYLE</u>	12/9/2011	Disposed		2/29/2012	Party Motion	
<u>AC 34088</u>	<u>PEGGY J. DAILY v. JACK L. DAILY</u>	12/6/2011	Disposed		9/17/2012	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 34068</u>	<u>JENNIFER NEWCOMER v. ROBERT NEWCOMER</u>	11/23/2011	Disposed		3/7/2012	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 34041</u>	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v. MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	11/1/2011	Disposed	3/21/2013	7/30/2013	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 34032</u>	<u>SUSAN CUNNIFFE v. MARK C. CUNNIFFE</u>	11/8/2011	Disposed		5/9/2012	Party Motion	
<u>AC 34032</u>	<u>SUSAN CUNNIFFE v. MARK C. CUNNIFFE</u>	11/8/2011	Disposed		5/10/2012	Party Motion	
<u>AC 34004</u>	<u>SARA ANN WALSH v. THOMAS J. WALSH</u>	11/2/2011	Disposed		2/15/2012	Court Motion	
<u>AC 33996</u>	<u>MARY MARGARET FARREN v. J.</u>	11/4/2011	Disposed	1/14/2013	4/23/2013	Opinion N/A	Affirmed

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

	<u>MICHAEL FARREN</u>								
<u>AC 33934</u>	<u>STATE OF CONNECTICUT v. MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	10/11/2011	Disposed	5/23/2012		Court Motion			
<u>AC 33925</u>	<u>ROBERT MONSON v. MICHELE MONSON</u>	10/4/2011	Disposed	10/31/2012		Withdrawn			
<u>AC 33913</u>	<u>BIRUTE ZITKENE v. ROMUALDAS ZITKUS</u>	9/27/2011	Disposed	10/12/2012	2/19/2013	Opinion 140 Conn.App. 856	Affirmed		
<u>AC 33858</u>	<u>CHARLOTTE MALPESO v. PASQUALE MALPESO</u>	9/6/2011	Disposed	12/6/2012	2/19/2013	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Further Proceedings		
<u>AC 33749</u>	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v. MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	8/2/2011	Disposed	11/9/2011		Party Motion			
<u>AC 33727</u>	<u>THERESA B. v. ROBERT B.</u>	7/6/2011	Disposed	8/31/2011		NISI Disposition			
<u>AC 33722</u>	<u>MARIE T. CIASULLO v. PAUL E. CIASULLO</u>	8/5/2011	Disposed	12/10/2012		Withdrawn			
<u>AC 33675</u>	<u>TAMARA S. CROUSE v. JOHN B. CROUSE</u>	7/15/2011	Disposed	12/19/2011		NISI Disposition			
<u>AC 33584</u>	<u>LISA BRUNO v. REED WHIPPLE ET AL.</u>	6/22/2011	Disposed	5/17/2012	10/16/2012	Opinion N/A	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings		
<u>AC 33564</u>	<u>CANDLEWOOD HILLS TAX DISTRICT v. PETER MEDINA ET AL.</u>	6/21/2011	Disposed	12/10/2012	6/11/2013	Opinion 143 Conn.App. 230	Reversed; Judgment Directed		

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>AC 33561</u>	<u>CAROLINE HIRSCHFELD v. ROBERT B. MACHINIST</u>	6/17/2011	Disposed	3/19/2012	8/28/2012	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 33539</u>	<u>JAMIE STYRCULA v. KEITH STYRCULA</u>	6/13/2011	Disposed	9/27/2012	12/25/2012	Opinion N/A	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 33492</u>	<u>ROBERT G. SIMSES v. ELAINE SIMSES</u>	5/25/2011	Disposed		11/18/2011	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 33492A01</u>	<u>ROBERT G. SIMSES v. ELAINE SIMSES</u>	6/15/2011	Disposed		11/18/2011	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 33403</u>	<u>MARY CUNNINGHAM v. GERARD CUNNINGHAM</u>	4/28/2011	Disposed	11/13/2012	2/12/2013	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 33356</u>	<u>RICHARD BUEHLER v. LILACH BUEHLER</u>	4/20/2011	Disposed	5/31/2012	9/11/2012	Opinion N/A	Reversed in Part; Judgment Directed
<u>AC 33354</u>	<u>DARBY FOX v. RODMAN FOX</u>	4/18/2011	Disposed	1/7/2014	9/9/2014	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 33334</u>	<u>PETER LARSON v. MATILDE LARSON</u>	3/24/2011	Disposed	4/12/2012	9/25/2012	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 33300</u>	<u>RICHARD M. GIBBONS v. SUZANNE E. GIBBONS</u>	3/24/2011	Disposed	9/13/2012	10/30/2012	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 33221</u>	<u>CINDY RINFRET v PETER A. RINFRET</u>	3/1/2011	Disposed		8/18/2011	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 33188</u>	<u>TAMARA S. CROUSE v. JOHN B. CROUSE</u>	2/7/2011	Disposed		12/7/2011	Court Motion	

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>AC 33082</u>	<u>PETER LARSON v.</u> <u>MATILDE LARSON</u>	1/18/2011	Disposed	4/12/2012	9/25/2012	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 33061</u>	<u>KENNETH CLARK</u> <u>v. MARY ANN</u> <u>CLARK</u>	11/19/2010	Disposed		3/30/2011	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 32983</u>	<u>THERESA N.</u> <u>CURTIS v. DAVID L.</u> <u>CURTIS</u>	12/14/2010	Disposed	1/11/2012	4/17/2012	Opinion 134 Conn.App. 833	Affirmed
<u>AC 32980</u>	<u>ELIZABETH A.</u> <u>GAARY v. PATRICK</u> <u>J. GILLIS</u>	12/7/2010	Disposed	2/19/2013	3/12/2013	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32928</u>	<u>DENISE E. BROWN</u> <u>v. WILLIAM A.</u> <u>BROWN</u>	12/7/2010	Disposed	9/8/2011	11/8/2011	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32898</u>	<u>SANDRA LYNN</u> <u>BUGGY N/K/A</u> <u>SANDRA</u> <u>MACVICAR v.</u> <u>GLENN MILLS</u> <u>BUGGY</u>	11/15/2010	Disposed	11/29/2012	4/2/2013	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32886</u>	<u>MARIANNE</u> <u>HOWATSON v.</u> <u>RICHARD</u> <u>FRIEDBERG</u>	11/8/2010	Disposed	3/14/2012	4/24/2012	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32826</u>	<u>TAMARA S.</u> <u>CROUSE v</u> <u>JOHN B. CROUSE</u>	11/16/2010	Disposed		2/23/2011	Party Motion	
<u>AC 32818</u>	<u>CAROLINE</u> <u>HIRSCHFELD v</u> <u>ROBERT B.</u> <u>MACHINIST</u>	10/22/2010	Disposed	6/2/2011	9/13/2011	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32784</u>	<u>SUZANNE E.</u> <u>BUBROSKY v</u> <u>HARRISON A.</u> <u>BUBROSKY</u>	10/4/2010	Disposed	4/27/2011	4/27/2011	Party Motion	

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>AC 32767</u>	<u>CECILE P. WINDELS v. RICHARD WINDELS</u>	10/12/2010	Disposed		1/5/2011	Court Motion	
<u>AC 32638</u>	<u>ERIC R. DAY v. DIANE L. DAY</u>	8/23/2010	Disposed		3/17/2011	Withdrawn – Settlement Program	
<u>AC 32635</u>	<u>ANN MYLES v. ROBERT MYLES</u>	8/25/2010	Disposed	11/15/2011	7/3/2012	Opinion N/A	Reversed in Part; Judgment Directed
<u>AC 32622</u>	<u>DENISE E. BROWN v. WILLIAM A. BROWN</u>	8/23/2010	Disposed	9/8/2011	11/8/2011	Opinion N/A	Dismissed
<u>AC 32555</u>	<u>STEVEN SIMES v. SUSAN SIMES</u>	8/5/2010	Disposed		11/2/2010	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32555</u>	<u>STEVEN SIMES v. SUSAN SIMES</u>	8/5/2010	Disposed		1/24/2012	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 32541</u>	<u>STATE OF CONNECTICUT v. MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	9/3/2010	Disposed		10/20/2010	Court Motion	
<u>AC 32485</u>	<u>RUTH F. PERRY v. STEPHEN C. PERRY</u>	7/14/2010	Disposed	5/31/2011	8/16/2011	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Judgment Directed
<u>AC 32426</u>	<u>DENISE E. BROWN v. WILLIAM A. BROWN</u>	7/6/2010	Disposed		12/14/2010	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 32388</u>	<u>KENNETH CLARK v. MARY ANN CLARK</u>	3/12/2010	Disposed	5/31/2011	8/23/2011	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32379</u>	<u>ADRIAN MARCUS v. DAWN CASSARA</u>	6/16/2010	Disposed	1/17/2013	4/30/2013	Opinion N/A	Affirmed

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

AC 32368	<u>RIDGEFIELD HOUSING AUTHORITY v RIDGEFIELD WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY</u>	6/14/2010	Disposed	5/20/2011	9/6/2011	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
AC 32340	<u>BERNARD KLEINMAN v ANN CHAPNICK</u>	6/1/2010	Disposed	9/12/2011	10/18/2011	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
AC 32327	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	5/27/2010	Disposed	3/14/2011	5/31/2011	Opinion 129 Conn.App. 157	Affirmed
AC 32327A01	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	7/29/2010	Disposed		5/31/2011	Opinion 129 Conn.App. 157	Affirmed
AC 32327A02	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	7/29/2010	Disposed		5/31/2011	Opinion 129 Conn.App. 157	Affirmed
AC 32327A03	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	8/10/2010	Disposed		5/31/2011	Opinion 129 Conn.App. 157	Affirmed
AC 32327A04	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	9/24/2010	Disposed		5/31/2011	Opinion 129 Conn.App. 157	Affirmed
AC 32327A05	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	12/13/2010	Disposed		5/31/2011	Opinion 129 Conn.App. 157	Affirmed
AC 32326	<u>VANESSA G. VARGAS v</u>	5/24/2010	Disposed	9/9/2011	7/9/2010	NISI Disposition	

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

	<u>FRANCISCO SPIGNOLIO</u>						
<u>AC 32326</u>	<u>VANESSA G. VARGAS v FRANCISCO SPIGNOLIO</u>	5/24/2010	Disposed	9/9/2011	9/27/2011	Opinion N/A	Dismissed
<u>AC 32320</u>	<u>TAMARA S. CROUSE v JOHN B. CROUSE</u>	6/3/2010	Disposed	4/27/2011	7/28/2010	Party Motion	
<u>AC 32320A01</u>	<u>TAMARA S. CROUSE v JOHN B. CROUSE ET AL.</u>	6/23/2010	Disposed		5/17/2011	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32197</u>	<u>FELICIA PIEROT BRODY v. CARY BRODY</u>	4/30/2010	Disposed	1/30/2012	7/17/2012	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32151</u>	<u>EDWARD BOCK v LUCILLE BOCK</u>	4/7/2010	Disposed	10/15/2010	3/29/2011	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32090</u>	<u>JACKIE M. SELBY ET AL. v THE BUILDING GROUP, INC., ET AL.</u>	3/15/2010	Disposed	4/20/2011	6/21/2011	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32075</u>	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	3/8/2010	Disposed	11/30/2010	12/21/2010	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 32065</u>	<u>LIBBY LIGHT v. DAVID GRIMES</u>	3/8/2010	Disposed	3/7/2012	6/5/2012	Opinion 136 Conn.App. 161	Affirmed
<u>AC 31984</u>	<u>MONTEL WILLIAMS v GRACE WILLIAMS</u>	2/5/2010	Disposed		4/6/2010	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 31947</u>	<u>RUTH F. PERRY v STEPHEN C.</u>	2/3/2010	Disposed	5/31/2011	8/16/2011	Opinion N/A	Affirmed

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

	<u>PERRY</u>						
<u>AC 31936</u>	<u>KATHA DIDDEL- WARREN v PAUL WARREN</u>	1/27/2010	Disposed		3/22/2010	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 31876</u>	<u>AUDREY GOLDSTEIN v MARK GOLDSTEIN</u>	1/17/2010	Disposed		4/28/2010	Party Motion	
<u>AC 31773</u>	<u>DONALD K. WIEGAND v CORINNE M. WIEGAND</u>	12/17/2009	Disposed	4/18/2011	6/21/2011	Opinion N/A	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 31722</u>	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	12/24/2009	Disposed		3/17/2010	Party Motion	
<u>AC 31721</u>	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	11/23/2009	Disposed		3/17/2010	Party Motion	
<u>AC 31721A01</u>	<u>SUZANNE NOWACKI v MICHAEL NOWACKI</u>	1/17/2010	Disposed		3/17/2010	Party Motion	
<u>AC 31651</u>	<u>DANIEL LYNCH v. LAURIE LYNCH</u>	10/26/2009	Disposed	11/16/2011	4/24/2012	Opinion N/A	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 31634</u>	<u>ROBIN WATSON v ARTHUR WATSON</u>	10/23/2009	Disposed		2/22/2012	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 31574</u>	<u>AUDREY GOLDSTEIN v MARK GOLDSTEIN</u>	10/20/2009	Disposed		7/9/2012	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 31574A01</u>	<u>AUDREY GOLDSTEIN v MARK GOLDSTEIN</u>	11/19/2009	Disposed		7/9/2012	NISI Disposition	

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>AC 31574A02</u>	<u>AUDREY GOLDSTEIN v MARK GOLDSTEIN</u>	12/9/2009	Disposed		7/9/2012	NISI Disposition	
<u>AC 31562</u>	<u>CAROLINE HIRSCHFELD v ROBERT B. MACHINIST</u>	10/30/2009	Disposed	6/2/2011	9/13/2011	Opinion N/A	Affirmed
<u>AC 31546</u>	<u>CYNTHIA GOULD v PETER GOULD</u>	9/30/2009	Disposed		1/7/2010	Party Motion	
<u>AC 31372</u>	<u>AUDREY GOLDSTEIN v MARC GOLDSTEIN</u>	8/18/2009	Disposed		1/13/2010	Party Motion	
<u>AC 31307</u>	<u>CYNTHIA GOULD v PETER GOULD</u>	7/23/2009	Disposed		1/7/2010	Party Motion	
<u>AC 31302</u>	<u>AUDREY GOLDSTEIN v MARC GOLDSTEIN</u>	7/24/2009	Disposed		5/17/2010	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 31245</u>	<u>JACQUELINE O'HARA v EDWARD O'HARA</u>	6/12/2009	Disposed		2/3/2010	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 31085</u>	<u>LORRAINE PARROTTA v MICHAEL PARROTTA</u>	5/18/2009	Disposed	12/10/2009	2/23/2010	Opinion 119 Conn.App. 472	Dismissed
<u>AC 31056</u>	<u>CELIA ZHRINGER v GEORGE J. ZHRINGER</u>	5/22/2009	Disposed	3/15/2010	11/2/2010	Opinion 124 Conn.App. 672	Reversed; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 30985</u>	<u>IRA B. STECHEL v PATRICIA LYNN FOSTER</u>	4/15/2009	Disposed	9/7/2010	12/7/2010	Opinion 125 Conn.App. 441	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings
<u>AC 30511</u>	<u>SHARI PANZER v ALAN PANZER</u>	11/10/2008	Disposed		3/19/2010	Withdrawn	
<u>AC 30167</u>	<u>HOWARD C. FRITZ</u>	7/22/2008	Disposed	12/6/2010	4/12/2011	Opinion	Affirmed

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

	<u>v</u> <u>JULIANNA M. FRITZ</u>					N/A		
<u>AC 30075</u>	<u>LISA A. FARKAS v</u> <u>SANDOR FARKAS</u>	6/11/2008	Disposed	11/12/2009	1/12/2010	Opinion 118 Conn.App. 827	Affirmed	
<u>AC 29978</u>	<u>KAREN B.</u> <u>SHAULSON v</u> <u>DAVID A.</u> <u>SHAULSON</u>	5/30/2008	Disposed	10/28/2010	12/28/2010	Opinion N/A	Affirmed	
<u>AC 29877</u>	<u>JOHN ADAMS</u> <u>MORGAN v. SONJA</u> <u>TREMONT</u> <u>MORGAN</u>	5/7/2008	Disposed	4/19/2012	6/26/2012	Opinion 136 Conn.App. 371	Dismissed	Remanded
<u>AC</u> <u>29877A01</u>	<u>JOHN ADAMS</u> <u>MORGAN v</u> <u>SONJA TREMONT</u> <u>MORGAN</u>	8/17/2009	Disposed		6/26/2012	Opinion 136 Conn.App. 371	Dismissed	Remanded
<u>SC 19615</u>	<u>JOAN LAFRANCE v.</u> <u>DEAN W. LODMELL</u>	2/3/2015	Disposed	4/6/2016	9/6/2016	Opinion 322 Conn. 828	Affirmed	
<u>SC 19614</u>	<u>JOAN LAFRANCE v.</u> <u>DEAN W. LODMELL</u>	4/17/2014	Disposed	4/6/2016	9/6/2016	Opinion 322 Conn. 828	Affirmed	
<u>SC 19571</u>	<u>RICHARD P.</u> <u>GABRIEL v. DIANA</u> <u>K. GABRIEL</u>	10/28/2015	Disposed	10/11/2016	12/28/2016	Opinion N/A	– Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings	
<u>SC 19519</u>	<u>SAVERIO</u> <u>SORRENTINO v.</u> <u>KATHRYN</u> <u>SORRENTINO</u>	7/22/2015	Disposed/Transfer		8/5/2015	Transferred		
<u>SC 19361</u>	<u>MARJORIE</u> <u>HORNUNG v.</u> <u>ROBERT</u> <u>HORNUNG</u>	4/4/2014	Disposed	11/3/2015	9/20/2016	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Judgment Directed	Affirmed

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

<u>SC 19217</u>	<u>FELICIA PIEROT</u> <u>BRODY v. CARY</u> <u>BRODY</u>	10/24/2013	Disposed/Transfer	4/4/2014	Transferred	
<u>SC 19211</u>	<u>JOHN L. REGAN v.</u> <u>SIOBHAN B.</u> <u>REGAN</u>	8/20/2013	Disposed	6/23/2014	NISI Disposition	
<u>SC 19210</u>	<u>JOHN L. REGAN v.</u> <u>SIOBHAN REGAN</u> <u>N/K/A SIOBHAN</u> <u>JONES</u>	10/9/2013	Disposed	10/15/2014	Party Motion	
<u>SC 19113</u>	<u>GREGORY</u> <u>MESNIAEFF v.</u> <u>ELIZABETH BURKE</u>	2/5/2013	Disposed	2/21/2013	Withdrawn	
<u>SC 19037</u>	<u>FELICIA PIEROT</u> <u>BRODY v. CARY</u> <u>BRODY</u>	10/4/2012	Disposed	9/15/2014	1/13/2015	Opinion N/A – Reversed in Part; Further Proceedings
<u>SC 18994</u>	<u>RUTH F. PERRY v.</u> <u>STEPHEN C.</u> <u>PERRY</u>	4/5/2012	Disposed	12/5/2013	7/22/2014	Opinion N/A Affirmed
<u>SC 18993</u>	<u>RUTH F. PERRY v.</u> <u>STEPHEN C.</u> <u>PERRY</u>	6/25/2012	Disposed	12/5/2013	7/22/2014	Opinion N/A Reversed; Judgment Directed
<u>SC 18943</u>	<u>RUTH F. PERRY v.</u> <u>STEPHEN C.</u> <u>PERRY</u>	3/28/2012	Disposed	6/12/2012	Party Motion	
<u>SC 18942</u>	<u>RUTH F. PERRY v.</u> <u>STEPHEN C.</u> <u>PERRY</u>	3/26/2012	Disposed	12/5/2013	7/22/2014	Opinion N/A Other
<u>SC 18881</u>	<u>SUZANNE</u> <u>NOWACKI v.</u> <u>MICHAEL</u> <u>NOWACKI</u>	11/1/2011	Disposed/Transfer	12/8/2011	Transferred	
<u>SC 18869</u>	<u>STATE OF</u> <u>CONNECTICUT v.</u> <u>MICHAEL</u>	10/11/2011	Disposed/Transfer	10/21/2011	Transferred	

Judge Schofield – Appeal Record – AC Report

Appeals with Disposition Dates from 1/1/2010 through 1/19/2017

	<u>NOWACKI</u>						
<u>SC 18824</u>	<u>SUZANNE</u> <u>NOWACKI v.</u> <u>MICHAEL</u> <u>NOWACKI</u>	6/23/2011	Disposed		9/14/2011	Party Motion	
<u>SC 18761</u>	<u>TAMARA S.</u> <u>CROUSE v. JOHN</u> <u>B. CROUSE</u>	2/7/2011	Disposed/Transfer		3/30/2011	Transferred	
<u>SC 18452</u>	<u>CATHERINE</u> <u>REVILLE v. JOHN</u> <u>REVILLE</u>	6/1/2009	Disposed	2/19/2013	7/8/2014	Opinion N/A	Reversed; Further Proceedings
<u>SC 18410</u>	<u>BRADY DOUGAN v</u> <u>TOMOKO HAMADA</u> <u>DOUGAN</u>	7/8/2009	Disposed	3/15/2011	7/5/2011	Opinion N/A	Appellate Court Affirmed