

ROBERT E. DEMEUSY

ASSOCIATE



AREAS OF PRACTICE

Asbestos and Mass Tort Litigation
Environmental & Toxic Tort Litigation
Product Liability

CONTACT INFO

(631) 227-6332
redemeusy@mdwvcg.com

175 Pinelawn Road
Suite 250
Melville, NY 11747

ADMISSIONS

New York
2016

EDUCATION

Fordham University School of Law
(J.D., 2015)

University of Miami (B.S.B.A.,
2012)

HONORS & AWARDS

New York Metro Super Lawyers
Rising Star, 2020 - present

YEAR JOINED

2021

OVERVIEW

Robert E. Demeusy has focused his practice on representing local and national clients in complex litigation, with significant experience in products liability and toxic torts. Robert handles cases from inception through disposition, including conducting depositions, performing legal research, drafting motions and providing detailed case analysis and defense strategy reports to clients and insurance carriers to facilitate effective case resolutions.

Robert earned his *juris doctor* from Fordham University School of Law in 2015. At Fordham, he was a member of the Fordham Journal of Corporate & Financial Law, and was also a member of the Fordham Sports Law Forum. While attending law school, he gained valuable experience working as an intern at the Brooklyn District Attorney's Office and at a civil litigation firm. In 2012, Robert earned his Bachelor of Business Administration from the University of Miami, with concentrations in Legal Studies and Sports Administration. He is a member of the American Bar Association, New York Bar Association and licensed to practice law in the State of New York.

RESULTS

After nine-week trial, unanimous defense verdict in asbestos case where \$40 million in damages had been sought.

Asbestos and Mass Tort Litigation

March 23, 2022

We obtained a unanimous defense verdict after a nine-week trial in Suffolk County, New York, where the plaintiff's counsel requested that the jury award \$40 million in damages. The plaintiff was 51 years old when she was diagnosed with peritoneal mesothelioma, allegedly as a result of being exposed to asbestos-containing joint compound manufactured and sold by our client. The plaintiff, who was 56 at the time of trial, testified that she had little or no knowledge of ever being exposed to asbestos.

SIGNIFICANT REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

Obtained a unanimous defense verdict after a nine week trial in Suffolk County, New York, where the plaintiff's counsel requested that the jury award \$40 million in damages. The plaintiff was 51 years old when she was diagnosed with peritoneal mesothelioma allegedly as a result of being exposed to asbestos containing joint compound manufactured and sold by our client. Plaintiff who was 56 at the time of trial, testified that she had little or no knowledge of ever being exposed to asbestos. However, her older sister, who served as the only product identification witness at trial, testified that she recalled that their father used asbestos containing joint compound on two occasions, approximately fifty years ago when he repaired their home after a fire in 1970 and when he built a home in Florida around 1975. Plaintiff was five and ten years old respectively during the alleged exposures and plaintiff's sister was seven years older. Plaintiff's sister testified that she had a vivid memory of her father using six different joint compounds during the two projects, including our client's product. She also testified that the plaintiff was present hundreds of times when their father mixed, applied and sanded the joint compound. At trial, we called an industrial hygienist, a toxicologist and an epidemiologist who testified that the type of asbestos fiber used in our client's joint compound did not cause or contribute to her mesothelioma, because the fibers are too short and do not cause disease. Our epidemiologist testified that plaintiff's mesothelioma developed spontaneously and was not the result of asbestos exposure. We also called a construction expert, who testified that the sister's testimony regarding the amount of joint compound used and the time the sister was exposed were excessive. The jury deliberated an hour before returning the verdict. Post-trial comments from jurors indicated they did not find the sister to be credible.