

KEVIN TODOROW

ASSOCIATE



AREAS OF PRACTICE

Appellate Advocacy & Post-Trial Practice

CONTACT INFO

(215) 575-2726
KTTodorow@MDWCG.com

2000 Market Street, Suite 2300
Philadelphia, PA 19103

ADMISSIONS

Pennsylvania
2018

U.S. Supreme Court
2022

U.S. Court of Appeals for the
Armed Forces
2022

U.S. Army Court of Criminal
Appeals
2022

OVERVIEW

Kevin is a member of the Professional Liability Department where he focuses his practice on appellate advocacy, including post-trial motions and appeals.

Prior to joining Marshall Dennehey, Kevin served as a Judge Advocate in the United States Army, first working in military justice, then representing soldiers convicted at courts-martial on appeal and arguing before the Army Court of Criminal Appeals and the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces. Kevin also served in the chambers of the Honorable Anne E. Lazarus of the Superior Court of Pennsylvania, where he drafted memoranda and opinions on a wide range of criminal and civil cases.

Kevin graduated from Penn State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in English and a Bachelor of Science degree in Economics. After working in advertising for several years, he attended Temple University School of Law, where he received his *juris doctor*. While at Temple, Kevin was a member of the law review as a staff editor and an editorial board member.

EDUCATION

Temple University Beasley School
of Law (J.D., 2018)

Pennsylvania State University
(B.S., 2011)

THOUGHT LEADERSHIP

Pennsylvania Supreme Court Reaffirms Pennsylvania's Statutory Employer Doctrine

Philadelphia - Headquarters
Appellate Advocacy & Post-Trial Practice
January 1, 2026

Immunity under Pennsylvania's Worker's Compensation Act is a powerful tool against tort liability—but the viability of the statutory employer doctrine was called into question when the Pennsylvania Supreme Court granted review to

ASSOCIATIONS & MEMBERSHIPS

Temple American Inn of Court,
2017

Philadelphia Bar Association

SIGNIFICANT REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

Obtained dismissal of claims by Summary Judgment in a Philadelphia premises liability case in which we represented both the landowner and tenant. The plaintiff originally demanded \$2 million, later reduced to \$800,000. Although our clients were responsible for sidewalk maintenance, the plaintiff's deposition testimony confirmed she tripped on a smaller portion of an alleged defect which was larger in other areas of the sidewalk. We successfully argued that this portion was de minimis and not actionable under Pennsylvania law. Despite a comprehensive opposition and a Motion for Reconsideration, the Court agreed with our arguments, dismissing all claims against our clients with prejudice.

YEAR JOINED

2024

