

## DAVID P. LEVINE

ASSOCIATE



### AREAS OF PRACTICE

Workers' Compensation

### CONTACT INFO

(973) 487-3121  
DPLevine@mdwcg.com

425 Eagle Rock Avenue  
Suite 302  
Roseland, NJ 07068

### ADMISSIONS

New York  
2022

New Jersey  
2023

### EDUCATION

Benjamin N. Cardozo School of  
Law (J.D., 2020)

University of Maryland (B.A., 2017)

### YEAR JOINED

2023

### OVERVIEW

David's practice is focused on defending clients in workers' compensation matters. He is dedicated to providing the highest quality legal services to help clients achieve their litigation goals and manage risk. David prioritizes maintaining an open and transparent line of communication to efficiently and effectively reach a resolution.

In his spare time, David enjoys the outdoors, whether it involves a hike upstate or a round at a local municipal golf course.

### THOUGHT LEADERSHIP

#### Navigating Preexisting Conditions in New Jersey Workers' Compensation Claims

Roseland  
Workers' Compensation  
February 18, 2025

#### When a Hotel Swim Becomes a Work Duty: The Implications of *Terhune v. Port Authority*

Roseland  
Workers' Compensation  
September 1, 2024

Key Points: Defense Digest, Vol. 30, No.

## RESULTS

### Obtained Dismissal with Prejudice in Complex Workers' Compensation Case

#### **Workers' Compensation**

**September 11, 2024**

We obtained orders for dismissal, with prejudice, where four New Jersey medical providers alleged they were entitled to additional monies for medical treatment provided in New Jersey to a New York resident. The underlying accident involved a laborer who resided in New York, worked in New York and sustained the injuries in New York. Four medical providers filed medical provider claims against the employer in New Jersey, seeking more than \$800,000 from the employer for treatment rendered in relation to this accident.

### Successfully proved that a claimant was not an employee/special employee of our client, the employer.

#### **Workers' Compensation**

**January 12, 2024**

We successfully defended a claim where a large cable provider (owner) hired a contractor to complete work at an out-of-state location, and various parts of the job were subcontracted to several different companies, one of which did not have New York workers' compensation insurance coverage. The contested issues were whether the Board has subject matter jurisdiction over this claim, what company employed the claimant, and whether the claimant was a covered employee.