

JOHN J. DELANY III

CHAIR, CATASTROPHIC CLAIMS LITIGATION
SHAREHOLDER



AREAS OF PRACTICE

Catastrophic Claims Litigation
Product Liability
Construction Injury Litigation
Asbestos & Mass Tort Litigation
Environmental & Toxic Tort Litigation
Automobile Liability
Trucking & Transportation Liability
Amusements, Sports & Recreation Liability
Hospitality & Liquor Liability

CONTACT INFO

(215) 575-2860
JJDelany@mdwcg.com

2000 Market Street, Suite 2300
Philadelphia, PA 19103

ADMISSIONS

Pennsylvania
U.S. District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania
U.S. District Court Middle District of Pennsylvania
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
New Jersey
U.S. District Court District of New Jersey
New York
U.S. Court of Appeals 3rd Circuit
U.S. Supreme Court

OVERVIEW

Jack defends catastrophic, high-profile, high-exposure cases against some of the country's most formidable plaintiff firms. With a focus on construction, asbestos and toxic torts, transportation, fire casualty and product liability, he has taken to conclusion more than 60 jury trials, as well as hundreds of bench trials, arbitrations and mediations. Additionally, Jack represents clients in litigation involving fire and explosion claims, sexual assaults, negligent security, and hospitality and dram shop claims. He also handles specialty, high risk claims in the areas of amusements, entertainment, recreational, sports and specialty events. Additionally, Jack has represented venues, contractors and building managers to name a few, in wrongful death suits and personal injury litigation involving elevators, electronic door issues and escalators. This litigation dealt with leveling, door closing, malfunctions and prolonged elevators stuck between floors.

He represents many Fortune 500 companies directly and as insureds, and handles complex litigation matters at the federal and state levels and in administrative agencies and alternate dispute resolution forums. Jack also serves as national coordinating counsel for several product manufacturers.

Prior to joining the firm, Jack was the founding partner of the [Delany Law](#) firm and co-founded [Delany & O'Brien](#), which operated for 24 years in Philadelphia. During his career, he also ran the Philadelphia office of a large New Jersey/New York firm and worked as assistant counsel for the Philadelphia Housing Authority.

Jack is a Certified Civil Trial Advocate by the National Board of Trial Advocacy and is certified by the Supreme Court of New Jersey as a Civil Trial Attorney. He is a member of the Federation of Defense and Corporate Counsel (FDCC), where he serves as Trial Masters Co-Chair, Technology Committee Co-Chair and Toxic Torts Co-Chair. He also enjoys serving pro bono as an adjunct professor in the Temple Law School Trial Advocacy Program, LLM and as a Judge Pro Tempore for the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas and is an author, editor and presenter on trial advocacy.

EDUCATION

Quinnipiac University School of Law (J.D., 1985)
Albright College (B.A., 1982)

HONORS & AWARDS

The Best Lawyers in America®,
Personal Injury Litigation -
Defendants
2026

Pennsylvania Super Lawyers
2004-2014, 2019-2025

Philadelphia Business Journal,
Best of the Bar Award
2023

ASSOCIATIONS & MEMBERSHIPS

Litigation Counsel of America

Federation of Defense and
Corporate Counsel

New Jersey Bar Association

New Jersey Defense Association

Pennsylvania Bar Association

Pennsylvania Defense Association

Philadelphia Bar Association

YEAR JOINED

2022

THOUGHT LEADERSHIP

Marshall Dennehey Trial Lawyers and Appellate Chair Talk Nuclear Verdicts in A.M. Best's Insurance Law Podcast

Catastrophic Claims Litigation
Health Care Liability
Appellate Advocacy & Post-Trial Practice
November 7, 2025

Three attorneys from Marshall Dennehey— John “Jack” Delany, III, Chair of Marshall Dennehey’s Catastrophic Claims Litigation Practice Group, veteran medical malpractice shareho

[Read More](#)

Combatting Nuclear Verdicts in Plaintiff-Friendly Jurisdictions

Philadelphia - Headquarters
Catastrophic Claims Litigation
Health Care Liability
October 30, 2025

98 Marshall Dennehey Attorneys Recognized in the 2026 Editions of The Best Lawyers in America® and the Best Lawyers: Ones to Watch® in America

August 20, 2025

Marshall Dennehey is proud to highlight the firm’s 98 attorneys who have been recognized in the 2026 editions of The Best Lawyers in America® and the Best Lawyers: Ones to Watch® in America. Less than 6% of all practicing lawyers in the U.S.

[Read More](#)

Are the Eyes a Window on One's Soul? American Mother - A Story of Grace, Humanity and Radical Empathy in the Law

Philadelphia - Headquarters
Catastrophic Claims Litigation
June 23, 2025

Marshall Dennehey Announces 2025 Pennsylvania Super Lawyers and Rising Stars

May 22, 2025

Thirty-three attorneys across Marshall Dennehey’s five Pennsylvania offices have been selected to the 2025 edition of Pennsylvania Super Lawyers magazine.

[Read More](#)

MEDIA COMMENTARY

“New Juror Attitudes Call For New Defense Strategies, Experts Say,” *The Legal Intelligencer*, April 10, 2023

CLASSES/SEMINARS TAUGHT

Combatting Nuclear Verdicts in Plaintiff-Friendly Jurisdictions, A.M. Best Insurance Law Podcast, October 30, 2025

When Every Second Counts: Managing Catastrophic Claims, A.M. Best Insurance Law Podcast, November 29, 2023

Strategies to Deal with Plaintiffs' Life Care Plans and How They Contribute to Nuclear Verdicts, Marshall Dennehey Client, August 29, 2023.

PUBLISHED WORKS

“Are the Eyes A Window to One's Soul? American Mother - A Story of Grace, Humanity and Radical Empathy in the Law,” *Federation Flyer*, publication of the Federation of Defense and Corporate Counsel (FDCC). Summer 2025

RESULTS

Summary Judgment Secured in “Exploding” Wine Bottle Case

Product Liability

January 30, 2023

We successfully secured summary judgment in a product liability case involving an “exploding” wine bottle. Our client was the distributor of the bottle and was brought into the case as a third-party defendant. The plaintiff testified that on Thanksgiving Day, she attempted to open the bottle with the handle of a wooden spoon when the bottle unexpectedly and suddenly exploded in her hands. The plaintiff brought a product liability claim, asserting defects with the design of the bottle in using unusually thin glass prone to breakage.

Summary Judgment Obtained in Significant Workplace Injury Case

Catastrophic Claims Litigation

June 30, 2023

We secured a motion for summary judgment in a significant workplace injury case involving a *Laidlow* claim. The court ruled that the plaintiff had failed to establish that his employer had committed an intentional and malicious act sufficient to circumvent the workers’ compensation exclusivity provision.

Pennsylvania Appellate Courts Uphold Nonsuit Obtained By Jack Delany In \$11.5 Million Construction Death Case

Appellate Advocacy & Post-Trial Practice

Catastrophic Claims Litigation

Construction Injury Litigation

April 5, 2023

By Order dated April 5, 2023, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania refused to review the Superior Court’s affirmance of a 2021 nonsuit obtained by Jack Delany in hotly contested litigation stemming from the death of a construction worker. John Hare and Shane Haselbarth handled the appeal along with Jack.

Jury defense verdict in high-stakes catastrophic litigation case.

Catastrophic Claims Litigation

Property Litigation

January 27, 2023

We obtained a defense verdict in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in a case where the plaintiff sought \$24.1M for alleged property damages and lost revenue.

SIGNIFICANT REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

Strategically defended and obtained the dismissal of a *Laidlow* claim asserted by the plaintiff who was acting within the course and scope of his employment with the defendant when he sustained a significant workplace injury. In a 37-page written opinion granting the defendant’s motion for summary judgment and addressing several other applications, the court ruled the plaintiff failed to establish that his employer committed an intentional and malicious act sufficient to circumvent the workers’ compensation exclusivity provision. In reaching this conclusion, the court applied the *Millison* “conduct” and “context” prongs, reasoning that the absence of prior accidents or evidence suggesting the plaintiff’s employer intentionally disabled a safety device, the lack of pre-incident OSHA violations or post-accident efforts by the employer to deceive OSHA, and the undeniable determination that the plaintiff’s incident was “part and parcel” of industrial life, all warranted the entry of summary judgment in favor of the defendant employer and the dismissal of the plaintiff’s claim. You can read the opinion [here](#).