

## CHRISTIAN A. WEIMANN

SHAREHOLDER



### AREAS OF PRACTICE

Product Liability  
General Liability  
Premises & Retail Liability  
Automobile Liability  
Asbestos & Mass Tort Litigation  
Environmental & Toxic Tort Litigation  
Trucking & Transportation Liability

### CONTACT INFO

(215) 575-2737  
CAWeimann@mdwvcg.com

2000 Market Street, Suite 2300  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

### ADMISSIONS

New Jersey  
2011

Pennsylvania  
2012

New York  
2023

### EDUCATION

Villanova University School of Law  
(J.D., 2010)

Loyola Marymount University  
(B.A., 2006)

### HONORS & AWARDS

The Best Lawyers: Ones to  
Watch®, Mass Tort  
Litigation/Class Actions -  
Defendants  
2021-2025

The Best Lawyers: Ones to  
Watch®, Transportation Law  
2024-2025

### YEAR JOINED

2016

### OVERVIEW

Christian is a member of the Casualty Department, primarily handling cases involving product liability, product warranty, motor vehicle liability, and toxic tort litigation. Prior to joining the firm in 2016, Christian was an associate attorney at a mid-sized law firm in Philadelphia where his practice focused on defending the interests of insureds and self-insured businesses in complex suits, including toxic tort cases, product liability cases, premises liability cases, and transportation and trucking cases.

Christian graduated from Loyola Marymount University in 2006 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in English. Christian received his juris doctor in 2010 from Villanova University School of Law. During law school, Christian clerked for the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office where he primarily worked in the Victim Impact Program, addressing the needs of victims with unique vulnerability, including the elderly, children, and victims of hate crimes, sexual abuse, stalking, and domestic violence. Christian was also a Staff Writer and Associate Editor of Student Works for the Villanova Environmental Law Journal, Inclusive Committee Representative for the Latin American Law Students Association, and a 2009 Public Interest Fellowship Program Summer Fellow.

## THOUGHT LEADERSHIP

### **Marshall Dennehey Announces 2023 Shareholder Class - Largest in Firm's 60-Year History**

December 8, 2022

Marshall Dennehey is pleased to announce that 20 attorneys, 12 men and eight women, have been elevated to shareholder effective January 1, 2023.

[Read More](#)

### **The Hills and Ridges Doctrine: A Property Owner's Best Friend When Conditions Get Slippery**

**Philadelphia - Headquarters**

**General Liability**

**Property Litigation**

**June 1, 2021**

Defense Digest, Vol. 27, No.

### **Potential Implications of Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Superior Court and BNSF Ry. v. Tyrrell on Mass Tort Litigation in Pennsylvania**

**Philadelphia - Headquarters**

**Asbestos & Mass Tort Litigation**

**March 1, 2018**

Key Points: Defense Digest, Vol. 24, No. 1, March 2018. Defense Digest is prepared by Marshall Dennehey Warner Coleman & Goggin to provide information on recent legal developments of interest to our readers.

#### **PUBLISHED WORKS**

"The Hills and Ridges Doctrine: A Property Owner's Best Friend When Conditions Get Slippery," *Defense Digest*, June 2021, Vol. 27, No. 3

"Potential Implications of *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Superior Court and BNSF Ry. v. Tyrrell* on Mass Tort Litigation In Pennsylvania," *Defense Digest*, Vol. 24, No. 1, March 2018

## RESULTS

### **Socially-distanced trial produces defense verdict for auto manufacturer.**

**February 9, 2021**

After a masked and socially distanced two-day trial in Bucks County, we obtained a defense verdict in favor of an automotive manufacturer. The plaintiff purchased a new 2018 vehicle on March 10, 2018. Approximately one year after the purchase, the plaintiff complained several times that the start/stop function shut off and would not restart. The manufacturer identified the problem and was working on a solution.

## **SIGNIFICANT REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS**

Obtained a defense verdict after a masked and socially distanced two day trial in Bucks County in favor of an automotive manufacturer. Approximately one year after purchasing a new vehicle, the plaintiff complained several times that the Start/Stop function shuts off and does not restart. The manufacturer identified the problem and was working on a solution. Meanwhile, the dealership told the plaintiff to turn off the Start/Stop function until a software update came out. The software update came out in early May of 2019, less than 80 days after the plaintiff's first complaint. The plaintiff asserted claims under the Pennsylvania Automobile Lemon Law, Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, Uniform Commercial Code, and the Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law that the vehicle's repair history was all related to an intermittent and still unrepaired Start/Stop issue with the car. The defense successfully proved through witness and expert testimony that the vehicle's mechanical problems were fixed in a timely fashion. The repair work done by the dealership under the warranty was effective, and reliable, and the problem was permanently repaired. After trial, the judge requested each side provide a memorandum with findings of fact and closing arguments. Upon review of same, a ruling was issued in our client's favor.

Obtained summary judgment in Delaware County, Pennsylvania for a slip and fall during an active snowstorm case. Plaintiff alleged after finishing work, she fell in snow during an active snowstorm and was injured while walking in the parking lot toward her car. Plaintiff's own admission, as well as cell phone video footage taken by a co-worker, confirmed that she fell during an active snowstorm. Plaintiff went to work that day wearing snow boots because she knew the weather was supposed to turn bad later that day. Plaintiff admitted that some plowing had already been performed by the time she left work. The court found that the meteorological evidence, cell phone video footage taken by Plaintiff's co-worker, and Plaintiff's own admission all triggered the application of the "hills and ridges" doctrine to this case. Pursuant to this doctrine, the defendant did not have an absolute duty to clear the premises of ice and snow while the snowstorm was occurring. Moreover, intervention through snow removal processes does not necessarily bar application of the hills and ridges doctrine. Where a landowner takes steps during the course of a snow event, he does not divest himself of the protections afforded to him under the hills and ridges doctrine.