

ROBERT J. ALDRICH, III

SHAREHOLDER



AREAS OF PRACTICE

Health Care Liability
Long-Term Care Liability

CONTACT INFO

(570) 496-4658
RJAldrich@mdwcg.com

50 Glenmaura National
Boulevard
Moosic, PA 18507

ADMISSIONS

Pennsylvania
2013

U.S. District Court Middle
District of Pennsylvania
2013

Supreme Court of
Pennsylvania
2013

U.S. District Court Eastern
District of Pennsylvania
2018

New York
2020

U.S. District Court
Northern District of New
York
2021

EDUCATION

Cooley Law School (J.D.,
magna cum laude, 2013)

Pennsylvania State
University (B.S., 2009)

HONORS & AWARDS

The Best Lawyers: Ones
to Watch®, Health Care
Law; Medical Malpractice
Law - Defendants
2021-2025

ASSOCIATIONS & MEMBERSHIPS

Pennsylvania Defense Institute, Secretary; former At-Large Board Member

YEAR JOINED

2016

OVERVIEW

As a member of the Health Care Department, Rob devotes his practice to defending healthcare professionals and institutions against malpractice liability claims in both Pennsylvania and New York. Rob also has extensive experience defending trucking and transportation companies in auto liability matters.

Rob's clients appreciate his deep personal investment in each case. He is a persuasive writer, efficient litigator and practical thinker, leading to effective and pragmatic defense strategies. Rob also has extensive knowledge of the judicial system, enabling him to analyze cases from the court's perspective.

Rob is an active member of the legal community. He is the current Secretary of the Pennsylvania Defense Institute, after previously serving as an at-large board member. Rob is also an active speaker and author on topics including management of health risk and claims, electronic medical records, audit trails and long-term care.

Rob graduated *magna cum laude* from Western Michigan University Thomas M. Cooley Law School. He obtained his undergraduate degree from the Pennsylvania State University and is a diehard Nittany Lion. Prior to beginning his career as a litigator, Rob completed judicial clerkships with the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania and the Monroe County Court of Common Pleas.

THOUGHT LEADERSHIP

Navigating the Digital Shift: Defending Medical Malpractice Claims in the Era of Patient Portals

Scranton

Electronic Medical Record & Audit Trail Litigation

April 22, 2025

Forum Non Conveniens Motion Prevails Despite Recent Venue Rule Change

Scranton

Health Care Liability

March 13, 2024

On January 1, 2023, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania unraveled a 20-year venue rule applicable to medical professional liability cases. Legal Updates for Health Care Liability – March 13, 2024, has been prepared for

Attention All Shoppers! There Is a Blue Light Special on Forum Selection in Pennsylvania Medical Malpractice Cases

Scranton

Health Care Liability

Long-Term Care Liability

September 1, 2023

Key Points: Defense Digest, Vol. 29, No.

Marshall Dennehey Announces 2023 Shareholder Class - Largest in Firm's 60-Year History

December 8, 2022

Marshall Dennehey is pleased to announce that 20 attorneys, 12 men and eight women, have been elevated to shareholder effective January 1, 2023.

[Read More](#)

A Civil Jury Trial During the Pandemic:

Observations From Those Who Know

Scranton

Health Care Liability

August 6, 2020

CLASSES/SEMINARS TAUGHT

Navigating the Digital Shift: Balancing The Benefits and Legal Risks of Patient Portals, Pennsylvania Association for Health Care Risk Management (PAHCRM) webinar, February 11, 2026

Navigating the Digital Shift: Balancing The Benefits and Legal Risks of Patient Portals, ASHRM Annual Conference, Charlotte, North Carolina, September 28, 2025

It Is Not All About the Virus: Defending "Other COVID-19" Pandemic Claims, ASHRM Annual Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, September 13, 2022

Artificial Intelligence and Dentistry: Protecting Yourself From Liability, client webinar, June 16, 2022

21st Century Cures Act: The Do's and Don'ts and Ways to Ensure Compliance, WVSHRM 2022 Spring Conference, May 20, 2022

21st Century Cures Act: The Do's and Don'ts and Ways to Ensure Compliance, client webinar, January 27, 2022

Legal Marketing on LinkedIn: Learn How Law Firms are Leveraging LinkedIn's Unique Data and Environment to Engage Clients and Prospects to Grow Their Business, Pennsylvania Defense Institute Annual Conference, Bedford Springs, Pennsylvania, July 15, 2021

21st Century Cures Act, webinar, Pennsylvania Association for Health Care Risk Management Spring Conference, April 15, 2021

Jury Trials in the Era of COVID-19, webinar, September 24, 2020

Preparing A Claim for Trial: How Recent Issues, Decisions and Trends Are Impacting Litigation Outcomes, client webinar, June 4, 2020

A Recurring Nightmare: Department of Health Citations and Their Impact on Corporate Liability and Punitive Damages, Marshall Dennehey Health Care and Health Law Seminar, November 7, 2019

2018 Update: The EMR, Audit Trails and Mobile Devices: How to Narrow Your Professional Liability Exposure, 14th Annual Medical Liability Insurance ExecuSummit, Uncasville, Connecticut, October 17, 2018

The Impact of Department of Health Violations on Corporate Liability,

PUBLISHED WORKS

"Navigating The Digital Shift: Defending Medical Malpractice Claims in the Era of Patient Portals," *The Legal Intelligencer's* Medical Malpractice Supplement, April 22, 2025

"Attention All Shoppers! There Is a Blue Light Special on Forum Selection in Pennsylvania Medical Malpractice Cases," *Defense Digest*, Vol. 29, No. 3, September 2023

"Pennsylvania Superior Court Reinforces Evidentiary Issues Commonly Raised in Medical Malpractice Trials," *Defense Digest*, Vol. 26, No. 1, March 2020

"A Civil Jury Trial During the Pandemic: Observations From Those Who Know," *The Legal Intelligencer*, August 7, 2020

"The Whole Is NOT Greater Than Its Parts - Third Circuit Applies Component-Level Analysis To Preemption of Hybrid Medical Devices," *CounterPoint*, April 2018

"Negligent Advice of a Class III Medical Device Sales Rep," *The Legal Intelligencer*, Medical Malpractice Supplement, April 11, 2017

RESULTS

Defense Verdict Received in Traumatic Brain Injury Case

Birth & Catastrophic Injury Litigation

October 3, 2025

We received a defense verdict after a two-day arbitration hearing in a traumatic brain injury case. With an initial \$5.25 million demand, the plaintiff alleged overmedication led to cardiac arrest and a traumatic brain injury resulting in permanent neurocognitive impairment. Through testimony from our providers and experts across internal medicine, pulmonology, toxicology, and neuropsychology, we demonstrated that the care met the standard, did not cause the arrest, and that any deficits could have been pre-existing.

Defense Verdict Obtained in Binding Arbitration Involving Medical Malpractice Claims

Long-Term Care Liability

July 11, 2025

We obtained a defense verdict in binding arbitration on behalf of a nursing home client. The plaintiff alleged that the nursing staff provided inadequate pressure-reducing devices and negligently cared for his lower extremity, allegedly resulting in a below-the-knee amputation and permanent and total disability.

Defense Verdict Obtained in Medical Malpractice Jury Trial

Health Care Liability

April 7, 2025

We obtained a defense verdict on behalf of an anesthesiologist after a medical malpractice jury trial in Lehigh County, Pennsylvania. The plaintiff, who underwent an elective right-shoulder surgery, alleged that the anesthesiologist and the certified registered nurse anesthetist who performed his laryngoscopy intubated him too soon, and under

suboptimal paralytic conditions, leading to permanent throat damage. After a five-day trial, the jury returned a defense verdict within 15 minutes.

Dismissal of All Claims Obtained in High-Value Medical Malpractice Case

Health Care Liability

June 28, 2023

We obtained complete dismissal of all medical malpractice claims against a hospitalist physician where the plaintiff's demand was \$23.9 million. As our client treated the plaintiff, a 53-year-old who had a stroke, promptly and within the standard of care, in addition to her not being on shift at the time of alleged malpractice, the court dismissed our client outright.

Dismissal of claims against optometrist.

Health Care Liability

December 2, 2021

We obtained dismissal of all claims against an optometrist in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. The plaintiff was incarcerated when the allegations at issue arose. He alleged medical malpractice and civil rights violations against various health care providers for treatment received while he was an inmate at SCI-Dallas.

SIGNIFICANT REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

Obtained a defense verdict in binding arbitration on behalf of a nursing home client. The plaintiff alleged that the nursing staff provided inadequate pressure reducing devices and negligently cared for his lower extremity, allegedly resulting in a below-the-knee amputation and permanent and total disability. Rob defended the case by establishing not only that the nursing staff treated the resident in accordance with the standard of care, but also that the resident's below-the-knee amputation was caused by vascular conditions and comorbidities and not by any alleged actions and/or inactions of the nursing home staff. After a lengthy arbitration, the arbitrator ultimately found in favor of the defense.

Obtained a defense verdict on behalf of an anesthesiologist after a medical malpractice jury trial in Lehigh County. The plaintiff, who underwent an elective right-shoulder surgery, alleged that the anesthesiologist and the CRNA who performed his laryngoscopy intubated him too soon, and under suboptimal paralytic conditions, leading to permanent throat damage. After a five-day trial, the jury returned a defense verdict within 15 minutes.

Obtained dismissal of all claims against an optometrist in an alleged medical malpractice and civil rights violation claim brought by an inmate at a state correctional institution. Rob filed a Motion to Dismiss on numerous grounds, including that the plaintiff's claims were time barred by the statute of limitations, failure to state a viable cause of action, and failure to file a Certificate of Merit pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1042.3. The judge ultimately granted the motion and dismissed all claims, finding that plaintiff's claims violated Pa.R.C.P. 1042.3 and the statute of limitations, and that the plaintiff failed to meet his burden that the discovery rule applied.

Received a unanimous defense jury verdict within thirty minutes of deliberation in a five-day fire-loss subrogation trial. This case was one of the first Pennsylvania civil jury trials held during the COVID-19 pandemic. Taking into account safety and social distancing protocols, jury selection took place in a local school auditorium, two witnesses presented testimony via Zoom, and everyone present in the courtroom was subject to temperature screenings and required to wear a face covering. Given the current national health situation, this trial could serve as an example of how the court system and counsel can adapt to the changing health and legal landscape.

Obtained entry of judgment of non pros based on the plaintiff's failure to timely and properly file a Certificate of Merit (COM) in accordance with Pa.R.C.P. 1042.3 on behalf of a nursing home chain and its consulting company. With the Complaint, plaintiff attached an expert report from a nursing expert but did not attach a COM. Defendants filed a Notice of Intent to Enter Judgment of Non Pros, and judgment was subsequently entered. The plaintiff then filed a Petition to Strike/Open the Entry of Judgment of Non Pros, arguing that the expert report attached to the Complaint constituted a COM. The defense successfully fought the plaintiff's attempts to open the judgment. The Court ultimately found that plaintiff's repeated failures to comply with the applicable rules placed their case "beyond the purview of equitable relief," and therefore reinstated the entry of judgment and dismissed plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice.

Received a defense verdict in less than one hour in a dental malpractice case involving allegations of the use of excessive force and the failure to obtain the patient's informed consent after a patient's jaw was fractured during a molar extraction. It was admitted that jaw fracture was a known risk of the extraction, but that the dentist did not warn the patient of this risk. It was also conceded that the dentist caused the fracture. Lastly, the patient's damages were not contested, which included the pain and suffering associated with the fracture and permanent numbness to the lower jaw. On cross-examination of the patient's seasoned expert, he was confronted with prior inconsistent testimony regarding his experience in extracting molars and his opinion that all risks of a procedure need to be shared with the patient. Further, the expert agreed with the defense's argument that the risk of jaw fracture of an erupted right lower molar was less than .0009% and the patient had a better chance of dying from complications associated with the extraction than suffering a fracture. The jury was persuaded by the defense's arguments early in the case due to the thorough cross-examination of the patient's expert.

Obtained a defense verdict in a nursing negligence claim. The plaintiff alleged to have suffered a fall in a hospital bathroom three days post-operatively that re-injured his surgically repaired knees. The nurses denied the patient fell to the ground and testified, consistent with their charting, that the patient lost balance in the bathroom and sat on a commode. There was a significant economic damage claim in that the plaintiff was a young restaurant owner who suffered two distinct orthopedic injuries that required multiple surgeries and additional future

care. The jury returned a defense verdict 50 minutes after deliberation began, finding that the nurses were not negligent.

Obtained a defense verdict on behalf a midwife defendant in an alleged failure to properly manage and care for a patient's labor and delivery, resulting in catastrophic injury to her child. Counsel for the minor-plaintiff argued that the pregnancy and labor were high risk and, therefore, it was below the standard of care to use intermittent auscultation (IA) during the second stage of labor. The plaintiff argued that the fetus suffered a catastrophic brain injury during the second stage of labor, resulting in cerebral palsy and daily intractable seizures. The child, six years of age, wheelchair bound and unable to speak or feed himself, will require lifetime supervision and care. The defense argued that the patient's pregnancy remained low risk, and therefore, IA was within the standard of care; that a sentinel event did not occur during the second stage of labor; and that child's brain injury occurred in the days leading up to the hospital admission for labor.

Obtained an entry of judgment on behalf of an urgent care physician. The plaintiff filed suit in magisterial district court in Wayne County, alleging that the physician negligently sutured a hand laceration, leading to dehiscence and the need for subsequent surgery. The plaintiff sought recovery of medical expenses and pain and suffering. At the bench trial, the defense sought dismissal based upon the plaintiff's lack of expert support for her claims, as is required in medical malpractice claims. The court agreed and entered judgment in the defendant's favor.

Obtained summary judgment in New York on behalf of a car dealership client. The dealership rented a vehicle to co-defendant, who was having his personal vehicle serviced at the dealership. That co-defendant was in an accident with the plaintiff while operating the dealership's rental. The plaintiff was operating a motorcycle and significant damages were alleged. The defense filed a motion for summary judgment pursuant to The Graves Amendment, which states that an owner of a motor vehicle that rents a vehicle to a person shall not be vicariously liable for harm to persons or property that arises out of the use or operation of that vehicle during the period of the rental, so long as certain additional criteria is met. The court agreed with the arguments raised in the motion and dismissed our client with prejudice.