

## THOMAS A. SPECHT

SHAREHOLDER



### AREAS OF PRACTICE

Appellate Advocacy & Post-Trial Practice  
Insurance Services – Coverage & Bad Faith  
Litigation

### CONTACT INFO

(570) 496-4612  
[TASpecht@mdwcg.com](mailto:TASpecht@mdwcg.com)

50 Glenaura National Boulevard  
Moosic, PA 18507

### ADMISSIONS

Pennsylvania  
1996

U.S. District Court Middle District  
of Pennsylvania  
2001

U.S. Court of Appeals 3rd Circuit  
2010

### OVERVIEW

Thomas concentrates his practice on insurance coverage disputes, defense of insurance bad faith claims, post-trial matters and appeals. He is admitted to practice in Pennsylvania, the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

In 1993, Thomas graduated *magna cum laude* from the University of Scranton. He then went on to attend Villanova University School of Law, receiving his *jurid doctor* in 1996.

Thomas is a member of the Wilkes-Barre Law and Library Association, the Lackawanna County Bar Association, the Pennsylvania Bar Association and the Defense Research Institute, where he is currently the Third Circuit reporter for DRI's *Certworthy* publication. Thomas is also the current editor in chief of *Defense Digest*—Marshall Dennehey's quarterly newsletter that updates its clients on important legal cases and issues.

### EDUCATION

Villanova University Charles  
Widger School of Law (J.D., 1996)

University of Scranton (B.A.,  
magna cum laude, 1993)

### HONORS & AWARDS

The Best Lawyers in America®,  
"Lawyer of the Year," Northeastern  
Pennsylvania, Insurance Law  
2025

The Best Lawyers in America®,  
Insurance Law; Litigation –  
Insurance  
2024-2026

BV® Distinguished™ by  
LexisNexis Martindale-Hubbell

---

## ASSOCIATIONS & MEMBERSHIPS

Defense Research Institute  
Lackawanna County Bar Association  
Pennsylvania Bar Association  
Wilkes-Barre Law & Library Association

---

## YEAR JOINED

2004

## THOUGHT LEADERSHIP

### **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](#)

### **109 Marshall Dennehey Attorneys Recognized in the 2025 Editions of The Best Lawyers in America® and the Best Lawyers: Ones to Watch® in America**

August 15, 2024

Marshall Dennehey is proud to highlight the firm's 109 attorneys who have been recognized in the 2025 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](#)

### **Marshall Dennehey Named 2024 Litigation Department of the Year for Appellate Law By ALM's Pennsylvania Legal Awards**

Appellate Advocacy & Post-Trial Practice

March 15, 2024

Marshall Dennehey was awarded with the 2024 Litigation Department of the Year for Appellate Law by ALM's prestigious Pennsylvania Legal Awards.

[Read More](#)

### **Denial of Insurer's Petition for Limited Intervention in Trial Court Action Against Insured to Determine Whether Coverage Exclusion Applies Is Immediately Appealable**

Scranton

Appellate Advocacy & Post-Trial Practice

Insurance Services – Coverage & Bad Faith Litigation

March 1, 2024

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

## RESULTS

Dismissal of all claims on the eve of trial where EMT plaintiff's demand was \$10 million.

**Emergency Medical Services**

**Health Care Liability**

**April 26, 2023**

The plaintiff was an Emergency Medicine Technician who was severely assaulted during an ambulance transport of a minor patient to a psychiatric facility. The client-physician had discharged the minor patient with orders for sedation and restraints, if needed, during transport. The plaintiff alleged these discharge orders were insufficient and violated standard of care. Our attorneys successfully argued that under Pennsylvania's Mcare Act our client-physician did not owe a duty to the plaintiff-EMT, only to the minor patient.

**Defense verdict for school district.**

**School Leaders' Liability**

**May 18, 2020**

We obtained a defense verdict after a one-week trial in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The case involved alleged race, gender and/or "intersectional" (race and gender) discrimination claims by two women against a Philadelphia area school district.

**Dog attack claim lacks "bite."**

**General Liability**

**July 25, 2019**

We obtained summary judgment in favor of our homeowner clients in a case involving an alleged "attack" by our client's dog. As the plaintiff walked past the client's property on a public sidewalk, the dog ran out to the edge of the sidewalk barking loudly. The plaintiff became "startled" and stepped back, falling into the street and sustaining a seriously displaced left distal radius fracture that required open reduction and internal fixation.

## SIGNIFICANT REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

Obtained complete dismissal of all claims on eve of trial where plaintiff's demand was \$10 million. Plaintiff was an emergency medicine technician (EMT) who was severely assaulted during an ambulance transport of a minor patient to a psychiatric facility. The client-physician discharged the patient with orders for sedation and restraints, if needed, during transport. The plaintiff alleged these discharge orders were insufficient and violated standard of care. The defense successfully argued that under Pennsylvania's Mcare Act, the client-physician did not owe a duty to the plaintiff-EMT, only to the minor patient, and further, that the plaintiff's Emergency Medicine expert was not qualified to opine on the standard of care provided by client-physician who is an Internal Medicine specialist in that plaintiff's expert had no expertise in the long-term management of psychiatric patients. Without an expert to opine on the applicable standard of care, the plaintiff's claim must fail. As a result, the court granted the motion for summary judgment and dismissed plaintiff's claims.

Achieved dismissal, and affirmance of dismissal on appeal, of an insurance bad faith/UTPCPL/breach of contract action seeking \$1,000,000 in permanent total disability benefits and extra-contractual damages, where court agreed that the Plaintiff's Complaint did not allege facts sufficient to come within the Policy's terms of coverage, and was not ambiguous.

Won summary judgment for insurer in an excess verdict bad faith case, where the underlying verdict came in at 14 times the last offer made by insurer, and subsequently achieved affirmance of summary judgment on appeal.

Obtained favorable coverage decision, that resulted in the dismissal of Luzerne County UIM case, in which the Claimant sought UIM policy limits of \$200,000.00, and had contended that her status as a "driver listed" on her former boyfriend's automobile policy, and payment of premiums for that status, entitled her to UIM coverage for injuries sustained in a motor vehicle accident.

Won motion for summary judgment that resulted in dismissal of coverage matter in which insured sought recovery for rain-damaged property, alternative living expenses and depreciation holdback, where wind during storm had blown tarp off of house during renovation project.

Obtained reversal of \$700,000 trial court award on appeal, where the Pennsylvania Supreme Court determined that dam owner was not responsible for flooding of downstream property owners and was not negligent as a matter of law.

In a case dealing with a novel issue in Pennsylvania insurance bad faith practice, convinced district court to grant a motion to dismiss portion of bad faith claim relating to denial of first party medical benefits, on the basis of PA MVFRL preemption, even though insurer had not utilized PRO process, but an IME, in which doctor had opined that Plaintiff had reached maximum medical improvement.

Attained dismissal of a UIM action on Preliminary Objections, where the trial court held that the plaintiff was not entitled to UIM coverage under his employer's commercial automobile policy, on the basis that the Pennsylvania Workers' Compensation Act precluded an action against the co-employee/tortfeasor directly.

Accomplished dismissal of breach of contract/insurance bad faith claim, and affirmance of dismissal on appeal, where the plaintiff sought coverage under Businessowners Coverage Form and Cargo Endorsement for spoilage of frozen veal product, convincing the courts that the Cargo Endorsement superseded, and did not conflict with, the language of the Coverage Form, and did not provide coverage for the loss.

Persuaded U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit to affirm dismissal of civil rights lawsuit alleging that local police officer engaged in a conspiracy to violate civil rights of plaintiff through an allegedly wrongful citation that lead to an adverse employment action being taken against the plaintiff.

In an action alleging that School District Defendants had defamed Plaintiff Charter School, convinced the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit to affirm dismissal of the defendants on the basis that the defendants were protected by high official immunity for defamation claims made against them in their official capacities, and because the charter school, as a governmental entity, was barred by the First Amendment from asserting a defamation claim against the defendants in their individual capacities.

## REPRESENTATIVE CASES

*Shamnoski v. PG Energy*, 858 A.2d 589 (Pa. 2004)