

## VLADA TASICH

CO-CHAIR, PRODUCT LIABILITY PRACTICE GROUP  
SHAREHOLDER



### AREAS OF PRACTICE

Product Liability  
Property Litigation  
Trucking & Transportation Liability  
Miscellaneous Professional Liability  
Construction Injury Litigation  
Class Action Litigation  
Lawyers' Professional Liability

### CONTACT INFO

(215) 575-2659  
vxtasich@mdwccg.com

2000 Market Street, Suite 2300  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

### ADMISSIONS

Pennsylvania  
2002

U.S. District Court Eastern  
District of Pennsylvania  
2002

U.S. District Court Western  
District of Pennsylvania  
2011

U.S. District Court Middle  
District of Pennsylvania

### EDUCATION

Catholic University of  
America, Columbus School of  
Law (J.D., 2001)

The George Washington  
University (B.A., 1997)

### OVERVIEW

Vlada Tasich is a litigation and trial attorney who has been defending the interests of companies and individuals in complex civil litigation matters throughout the state and federal courts of Pennsylvania for nearly twenty years. As co-chair of the firm's Product Liability Practice Group, his experience encompasses all aspects of motor vehicle design and manufacture, appliances, consumer electronics, residential and industrial fires, durable medical equipment, industrial equipment, exercise equipment, perishable items and many other consumer goods. He also represents clients in matters involving pharmacy malpractice, premises liability, transportation litigation, construction accidents and consumer class actions. Vlada's clients have retained him to coordinate litigation nationally and to serve as regional counsel.

Having previously been recognized as a "Rising Star" by Pennsylvania Super Lawyers from 2010 to 2012, Vlada has been selected to the Pennsylvania Super Lawyer list for product liability defense each year since 2015. He also is frequently asked by clients and industry organizations to lecture on various issues in product liability, premises liability, and motor vehicle law.

Born and raised in Philadelphia, Vlada received his B.A. from George Washington University in 1997 and his J.D. from the Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law in 2001.

### THOUGHT LEADERSHIP

# Marshall Dennehey Announces 2021 Pennsylvania Super Lawyers and Rising Stars

May 26, 2021

Forty-five attorneys from the Pennsylvania offices of Marshall Dennehey Warner Coleman & Goggin have been selected to the 2021 edition of Pennsylvania Super Lawyers magazine.

[Read More](#)

## Tincher - One Year Later

**Philadelphia - Headquarters**

**Product Liability**

**December 1, 2015**

By Vlada Tasich, Esq.\* Key Points: Defense Digest, Vol 21, No. 4, December 2015

## CLASSES/SEMINARS TAUGHT

*Autonomous Vehicles: The Rise of the Machines*, ILG Virtual Conference, March 25, 2021

"The Approaching Wave of Autonomous Vehicles Drives New Risks to Insurers," *A.M. Best Insurance Law Podcast*, June 27, 2019

## PUBLISHED WORKS

"*Tincher - One Year Later*," *Defense Digest*, Vol. 21, No. 4, December 2015

"Owners of Registered but Uninsured Vehicles Beware Pennsylvania Superior Court Ruling Makes First Party Benefits Unrecoverable," *Defense Digest*, Vol. 9, No. 4, December 2003

## RESULTS

### Defense prevails in workplace injury/premises liability case.

**Premises and Retail Liability**

**August 24, 2020**

The defendants were two family-owned companies that grow, process and sell mushrooms. One defendant, our client, owned the property, and the other operated the business there. The plaintiff worked for an independent company that was contracted to load compost into the defendants' mushroom beds. The plaintiff encountered a problem with the equipment used to lift the compost (the source of the problem is in dispute).

# Summary Judgment in Class Action Lawsuit On Behalf of Large Insurer.

## Class Action Litigation

**August 24, 2018**

We obtained summary judgment in a putative class action lawsuit in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania on behalf of a large insurer. The case dealt with a letter the insurance carrier would send to their insureds following a motor vehicle accident in which they advised their insureds that they would have a rental vehicle for five days. The named plaintiffs argued the letter misrepresented the policy language and they sued for breach of contract, bad faith, declaratory judgment and equitable relief.

## SIGNIFICANT REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

Successfully defended dealer of an asphalt compactor in a two-week product liability trial in Philadelphia County. Plaintiff sustained a severe crush injury to the leg, and the jury returned a verdict against defendants dealer and manufacturer for over \$900,000. On motion for judgment as a matter of law, the Court granted the client's cross-claim for indemnity against the co-defendant manufacturer on a pass through liability theory based on absence of evidence of substantial change to the product by dealer.

Defense verdict in week-long product liability trial in Philadelphia County for global electronics manufacturer involving a fire loss allegedly due to one of its microwave ovens. There was no direct evidence of the alleged defective condition, and the plaintiff proceeded on malfunction theory. Unanimous jury found the plaintiff failed to eliminate all other possible causes of the fire.

Obtained dismissal of major vehicle manufacturer by non suit after week-long product liability trial in Philadelphia County involving industrial equipment after plaintiffs failed to present evidence of negligence and causation.

Denial of class certification in action against insurance carrier for alleged breach of fiduciary duties and violations of insurance regulations.

Denial of class certification in action against insurance company for alleged violations of the Pennsylvania Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility Law.

Successful defense and resolution of numerous class actions involving claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, Fair Debt Collections Practices Act, Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, and other state consumer protection laws.

Successful defense of national retail chain during four day trial in Philadelphia County premises liability action. Plaintiff fell on defendant's premises allegedly due to insufficient safety precautions taken by store employees, and sustained a traumatic brain injury. Pretrial settlement demand was \$500,000. Liability was contested, and competing adverse inference instructions were given by the Court for alleged evidence spoliation. Plaintiff contended defendant failed to preserve security camera footage. The defense offered expert testimony that a key scene photograph taken by plaintiff had been altered. Upon deliberation, the jury found 50% liability against plaintiff and returned a four-figure nuisance verdict.