

Christopher M. Reeser

Office Managing Attorney

CMReeser@mdwccg.com

Harrisburg – 717.651.3509



With 29 years of litigation experience in a diverse range of practice areas, Chris represents and defends clients in matters involving motor vehicle, premises liability, construction defect and pharmacy liability. His deep understanding of these areas and breadth of experience is a valuable asset to his clients. Chris also serves as the Casualty Supervisor and Managing Attorney of the Harrisburg office. In this capacity, he oversees the day-to-day operations for the entire office and team of attorneys ensuring that client matters are handled promptly, professionally and effectively.

Chris has represented several large and small automobile insurance carriers and their insureds, numerous hotels, conference centers, and hotel chains as well as grocery store chains, convenience stores, retail stores, pharmacies, and industrial facilities. Chris has defended a number of significant and catastrophic cases involving injuries on building and roadway construction sites. He has also handled a number of underinsured motorist arbitrations and has extensive experience with mediation and arbitration.

Chris also defends fraternal organizations, schools and universities in matters involving contractual disputes, indemnity, dram shop and general negligence. He has counseled and represented clients in matters related to insurance coverage and professional liability. Additionally, he handles cases involving elevators, escalators, moving walkways, electronic doorways, cranes and lifts representing clients in alleged elevator, escalator malfunctions and negligent maintenance.

During his career, Chris has had significant experience handling several hundred motor vehicle matters involving third-party liability, uninsured and underinsured motorist claims along with several hundred premises liability cases. He has litigated jury trials to verdict in 15 different counties in state from South Central Pennsylvania to the Northern tier as well as in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. Chris has also been appointed by the President Judge of Dauphin County on multiple occasions to serve as an arbitrator, including a two-year term in which he was asked to

Practices

- Automobile Liability
- Premises & Retail Liability
- Product Liability
- Environmental & Toxic Tort Litigation
- Trucking & Transportation Liability
- Architectural, Engineering & Construction Defect Litigation
- Fraud/Special Investigation
- Construction Injury Litigation
- Catastrophic Claims Litigation
- Amusements, Sports & Recreation Liability

serve as the Chairman of an arbitration panel.

Chris is a graduate of Albright College in Reading and the Widener University School of Law in Harrisburg. Chris started practice in Williamsport, working with a small litigation firm. He joined the Williamsport office of Marshall Dennehey in 1997 as an associate and he was elected a shareholder in 2002. In 2004, Chris returned to his hometown of Harrisburg to work in our Harrisburg office.

Education

- Widener University Delaware Law School (J.D., 1994)
- Albright College (B.A., 1991)

Admissions

- Pennsylvania, 1994
- U.S. District Court Middle District of Pennsylvania, 1995
- U.S. Court of Appeals 3rd Circuit, 2007
- Maryland, 2016
- U.S. District Court District of Maryland, 2020

Honors & Awards

- AV® Preeminent™ by Martindale-Hubbell®
- The Best Lawyers in America®, "Lawyer of the Year," Harrisburg, Personal Injury Litigation – Defendants (2025)
- The Best Lawyers in America®, Personal Injury Litigation - Defendants (2022-2025)
- Central Penn Business Journal "Power List For Law" (2025)

Associations & Memberships

- Dauphin County Bar Association
- Pennsylvania Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
- Pennsylvania Bar Association
- Pennsylvania Defense Institute

Classes/Seminars Taught

- *Fundamentals of Personal Injury*, June 2014
- *Pennsylvania's Fair Share Act* - PAMIC Claims Summit, March, 2012
- *Basics of Auto Law – Defense Perspective*, September 2012
- *Handling the Auto Injury Claim: Settle the Case Without Going to Court*, National Business Institute, August 2008
- *Releases and Settlements - Tactics, Tips and Techniques*, 2007 PAMIC Summit
- *Tort Claims Act*, Pennsylvania Association of Township Supervisors

Published Works

- *Two Scoops: Superior Court Allows UM/UIM Claimants to Double Dip Workers' Compensation Benefits*, Defense Digest, Vol. 11, No. 3, September, 2005
- *Superior Court Holds New Trial is Warranted Whenever Jury Seeks Own Expert*

Significant Representative Matters

- A defense verdict in a toxic tort case in which the plaintiff claimed neuro-cognitive deficits as a result of exposure to pesticide which was applied in her home. The plaintiff had called preminent experts from around the country in the fields of industrial hygiene, occupational medicine, neurotoxicology and pesticide application in support of her claim. The jury found that our client, a large pest control company, was not negligent.
- Successful defense of a subrogation claim brought against the manufacturer of a lighting fixture in which it was claimed that the design of the light caused the fire to occur. We were able to establish that the fire was not caused by the design of the light but instead by the misuse of the product by the homeowner, who did not follow the warnings contained on the light regarding its use in conjunction with a salt water aquarium.
- Successfully obtaining the dismissal of a fraud claim against a client during trial in the Middle District of Pennsylvania which greatly reduced the insured's exposure in a fire loss case at a commercial facility. The dismissal of the fraud claim insulated our client, a small company, from uninsured exposure.
- Successfully defending a large tree cutting company in a case in which it was alleged that an employee of the company was negligent in assisting a mechanic who was performing repairs to the hydraulic system on a boom truck resulting in a crush injury to the mechanic in which he lost a portion of bone in his forearm following contraction of MRSA.
- Successfully defending a nail salon in a fall down case in which the plaintiff claimed that she was improperly escorted to a chair following a pedicure and had to undergo a multi-level cervical fusion as a result of her fall.
- Successfully defended a claim against a pharmacy in which the plaintiff, a physician, was dispensed an antipsychotic medication instead of his usual beta blocker. As a result, the plaintiff claimed post traumatic stress disorder and a permanent loss of income as a result of suffering stroke-like conditions requiring him to be life flighted to a hospital. The jury concluded that the plaintiff did not sustain post traumatic stress disorder and suffered no permanent physical injury and awarded only a nominal amount of money.
- Successfully defended a fraternal organization which was sued as a result of an alleged assault by a security guard against an animal rights protestor outside of a circus. The jury concluded that the assault did not occur and the case resulted in a defense verdict.

Representative Cases

- *Gandhi v. Metropolitan Property & Casualty Insurance Co.*, 2020 WL 7769776
- *Marks v. The Reserve at Hershey Meadows*, LEXIS 47325 (U.S. Dist. 2007)
- *Calhoun v. Prudential General Ins. Co.*, LEXIS 44302 (U.S. Dist. 2005)
- *Allstate v. Leiter*, 306 F.Supp. 2d 488 (M.D. Pa. 2004)

Results

Summary Judgment Won in a Premises Liability Action

We obtained summary judgment on behalf of two homeowners in a premises liability action. One of the homeowners called his father, the plaintiff, asking him to come to his house because he was having his roof replaced and had concerns about the work being done. The plaintiff arrived at the home and observed nails and other debris strewn about the entire property. Nonetheless, he entered the property to assess the roofing work and took care to avoid stepping on any nails. As he was leaving the property, he stepped on a nail, which went through his foot. The plaintiff asserted claims of negligence against both homeowners and also attempted to assert that, because his son requested that he come to inspect the roofing work, he was a business invitee rather than a licensee. We argued that the plaintiff was a licensee as he was a social guest who was merely providing advice to his son. They further argued that the homeowners owed no duty to the plaintiff as he knew the nails were strewn about the property and he understood the risk involved in walking there. We also argued that the plaintiff's claim was barred by assumption of risk because as he was aware of the nails on the property and, nonetheless, voluntarily proceeded to walk onto the property. The court agreed and granted summary judgment in favor of the homeowners.

Summary Judgment Obtained in a Premises and Product Liability Case

We won a motion for summary judgment in Schuylkill County, PA, in a premises liability and product liability case. We represented the manufacturer of a concrete railroad crossing that was installed at an intersection in 2005. In 2021, the plaintiff was riding his bike across the crossing when his bike tire allegedly became stuck in a gap in the concrete. There was ample evidence that the railroad was responsible for inspecting and maintaining the crossing while our client did nothing other than supply the prefabricated crossing. We argued the gap that developed in the crossing was not the responsibility of the crossing manufacturer and that the statute of repose barred the lawsuit. The court agreed and granted summary judgment in favor of the manufacturer.

Summary Judgment Obtained in Case Involving Disgraced Business Owner

We secured summary judgment and dismissal of nine claims brought by an individual employer against two former employees and their new place of employment. The plaintiff, who owned an insurance business and a tax preparation business, alleged claims of breach of contract, breach of the duty of loyalty, tortious interference, violations of the Pennsylvania Uniform Trade Secrets Act, and other related claims against two former employees, one at-will and one independent contractor, and their new employer. The plaintiff was imprisoned for violations of insurance fraud and barred from continued participation in the business of insurance. While imprisoned, one defendant, an at-will insurance underwriter employee, sent a letter to the business's customers informing them that the plaintiff was no longer legally allowed to participate in the business of insurance. The plaintiff also alleged that the other defendant misappropriated trade secret information by taking a customer list with him to his new employer. We argued that the plaintiff lacked a trade secret interest over the customer list, and that all remaining claims should be dismissed because the statements made in the insurance employee's letter were truthful. The trial judge agreed and dismissed all of the plaintiff's claims against the three defendants, with prejudice.

Defense Verdict in Deli Case Premises Liability Lawsuit.

Obtained a defense verdict on behalf of a supermarket in a premises liability case in the Court of Common Pleas of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania. The plaintiff claimed that she was injured when her hand was trapped in a deli case door that was closed by an inattentive employee. She claimed that in an attempt to free her hand from the deli case, she suffered an injury to her shoulder and her neck. MRI scans after the incident did show degenerative disc disease in her neck, as well as multiple herniated discs. Her treating orthopedic surgeon attributed the injuries to the incident in question and recommended a cervical fusion. Through investigation, we learned that the plaintiff had filed a lawsuit in New York as a result of a fall in 2007. We obtained a transcript of the plaintiff's deposition from the prior lawsuit, which indicated that her treating physician in the New York case had recommended the same health care procedures that had been recommended after this incident. The jury did find the employee who closed the deli case door on the plaintiff's hand to be negligent. The jury also found that the plaintiff was negligent in sticking her hand in the area of an open deli case and that the plaintiff's negligence outweighed the defendant's negligence, barring her recovery.