

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.