

Brad E. Haas

Shareholder

BEHaas@mdwccg.com

Pittsburgh – 412.803.2448



Brad is a shareholder in the Casualty Department and concentrates his practice on the defense of companies and individuals in a wide array of civil litigation matters. He has successfully litigated cases involving automobile and trucking liability, premises liability, breach of warranty, insurance coverage/bad faith litigation and general liability matters. Brad's experience includes efficiently managing files from inception through settlement or verdict. Brad also has significant alternative dispute resolution experience, having resolved hundreds of cases through mediation and arbitration throughout Pennsylvania.

Additionally, Brad handles fraudulent claims as part of our Fraud and SIU group. He conducts Examinations Under Oath, depositions, mediations, and appears for bench trials and arbitration hearings.

Brad has been awarded an AV® Preeminent™ rating by Martindale-Hubbell. Throughout his career, he has been active in the preparation of articles in his fields of concentration and has given numerous presentations to clients regarding various casualty defense-related matters.

In addition to his legal practice, Brad is involved with several organizations throughout the community. Brad is a USA Hockey On-Ice official and officiates games at the high school and college levels throughout the tri-state area. Brad performs legal pro-bono work on behalf of the Wills for Heroes Foundation, providing wills and powers of attorney to police officers and EMTs. Formerly, Brad served as a founding member of the Board of Directors for the Gift of Adoption Fund-Pittsburgh Chapter, a national charitable organization.

Brad is a 2010 graduate of West Virginia University. He received his *juris doctor* from the Case Western Reserve University School of Law in 2013, where he served as an executive editor of the school's Journal of Law-Medicine. While in law school, Brad received a merit-based academic scholarship for outstanding academic performance.

Practices

- Automobile Liability
- General Liability
- First-Party Property
- Premises & Retail Liability
- Insurance Services – Coverage & Bad Faith Litigation
- Rideshare Liability
- Fraud/Special Investigation

Education

- Case Western Reserve University School of Law (J.D., 2013)
- West Virginia University (B.S., 2010)

Admissions

- Pennsylvania, 2013
- U.S. District Court Western District of Pennsylvania, 2013

Honors & Awards

- AV® Preeminent™ by Martindale-Hubbell®
- The Best Lawyers: Ones to Watch®, Insurance Law; Personal Injury Litigation - Defendants (2021-2025)
- The Best Lawyers: Ones to Watch®, Product Liability Litigation – Defendants (2024-2025)
- Pennsylvania Super Lawyers Rising Star (2023-2026)

Associations & Memberships

- Allegheny County Bar Association
- American Bar Association
- Gift of Adoption Fund, Board of Directors
- West Virginia University Alumni Association, Pittsburgh Chapter, Board of Directors

Representative Cases & Matters

Obtained a defense verdict following a jury trial related to an automobile accident. Brad's client admitted to liability for causing the accident at trial. Despite this admission, during trial Brad was able to convince the jury that Plaintiff's limited tort selection applied and that her alleged injuries did not breach the limited tort threshold. The jury returned a verdict against Plaintiff on the limited tort issue, resulting in a complete defense verdict.

Secured an extremely favorable verdict following a jury trial solely on damages arising out of a motor vehicle accident. Plaintiff alleged a collision with the Defendant's large truck caused serious head and neck injuries. Through cross examination, Brad was able to demonstrate the Plaintiff's injuries were largely related to significant pre-accident and degenerative medical conditions. At the conclusion of trial, the jury awarded Plaintiff less than four percent of her settlement demand.

Negotiated a mid-trial settlement equivalent to less than six percent of the Plaintiff's demand on behalf of an automotive dealership. The Plaintiff sought compensation for spinal injuries allegedly caused by a hazardous condition on the company's premises. Extensive discovery revealed the Plaintiff had a pre-existing history of spinal issues unrelated to the incident in question. Additionally, evidence from social media and surveillance was leveraged to undermine the credibility of the Plaintiff's allegations. The case was settled just prior to opening statements.

Successfully defended a national carsharing company, resulting in a dismissal of all claims. The case involved a multi-party suit arising out of a commercial auto accident. Through aggressive pleading, Brad obtained a dismissal by arguing that both Federal and State law provisions prohibited any claims against the company. Brad additionally argued the facts as set forth in Plaintiff's Complaint failed to establish any duty and/or breach on the client's behalf.

Obtained a favorable settlement in seven-figure lawsuit, involving a tractor-trailer accident. Following significant discovery, Brad was able to secure a settlement significantly below Plaintiff's initial demand, after uncovering pre-accident medical records, which identified various inconsistencies related to Plaintiff's alleged medical damages.

Secured a dismissal of Plaintiff's claims via a Motion for Summary Judgment in a lawsuit involving a six-vehicle commercial automobile accident. Brad argued Plaintiff's own deposition testimony, along with documentary evidence failed to establish any negligence on the part of the Defendant.

Secured a favorable verdict in a non-jury trial based on an alleged breach of an automobile warranty. Following testimony, the judge awarded less than ten percent of Plaintiff's pre-trial settlement demand.

Successfully defended an insurance company in multiple direct lawsuits brought by an insured. Plaintiff alleged property damages arising out of a motor vehicle accident. Plaintiff also alleged, in a separate lawsuit, that the insurance company failed to comply with the terms of a warranty and acted in bad faith. Brad argued that Plaintiff lacked standing to bring these suits, while also disputing the merits of Plaintiff's allegations. The cases were dismissed via a Motion for Judgment Non Pros and a Motion for Summary Judgment.

Secured a dismissal of all claims via Summary Judgment on behalf of a national grocery store chain. Plaintiff alleged she was caused to fall in the store due to an accumulation of a wet substance. Deposition testimony and written discovery revealed that Plaintiff could not identify what the substance was, how long it had been present, or whether the store had notice of the substance. Based upon this the Court granted the store's Motion for Summary Judgment.

Negotiated a favorable settlement in a six-figure UIM/Bad Faith case. Discovery and deposition evidence revealed Plaintiff had pre-existing injuries, which were not initially reported. Research further revealed Plaintiff working a second, under-the-table job during her alleged disability period. This information eventually led to a successful settlement on behalf of our client.

Secured a dismissal of Plaintiffs' claims in a product liability lawsuit brought against a national manufacturer. Plaintiffs alleged they sustained property damage due to a defective washing machine. Brad argued that Plaintiffs could not establish the requisite expert testimony to pursue a specific design theory; or the requisite documentary

evidence to proceed under a malfunction theory. As a result, the Court granted the Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment.

Obtained Summary Judgment on behalf of an insurance agency in a seven-figure negligent procurement case. The trial court's ruling was based upon a determination of a lack of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, and causation on behalf of both the insurance agent and agency.

Successfully defended a global food service corporation against a Plaintiff alleging various violations under 42 U.S.C. 1981 and 42 U.S.C. 1985. In our client's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, Brad argued Plaintiff's section 1981 right to contract claims were invalid as she failed to demonstrate any contractual impairments. Brad argued Plaintiff's section 1985 claims were barred by the intracorporate conspiracy doctrine, as the alleged conspiracy involved two employees of the same company. Plaintiff's claims were dismissed in their entirety.

Obtained a defense judgement at arbitration on behalf of an apartment complex in a case involving a Plaintiff's suit for invasion of privacy and negligent infliction of emotional distress. Brad argued that Plaintiff's claims for invasion of privacy were legally insufficient, as there existed no proof of an actual intrusion. He further argued that Plaintiff could not pursue her negligent infliction of emotional distress claim, as she suffered no physical harm.

Obtained multiple defense judgments on behalf of various auto manufacturers involved in breach of warranty lawsuits.

Classes/ Seminar Taught

- *Defense Litigation: Key Concepts and Current Developments*, Marshall Dennehey Client Seminar, March 2026
- *Defense Perspectives: Bodily Injury and Bad Faith Claims*, Marshall Dennehey Client Seminar, April 2025
- *Discovery 2.0: Understanding and Utilizing New-Age Discovery Sources*, ClaimsXChange Annual Conference, October 2024
- *Northeastern Casualty and Worker's Compensation Litigation Trends*, Marshall Dennehey Client Seminar, June 2024.
- *Auto and Premises Liability Case Strategy and Evaluation*, Marshall Dennehey Client Seminar, May 2024
- *Pennsylvania and New Jersey Defense Litigation Updates and Strategies*, Marshall Dennehey Client Seminar, June 2023
- *Pennsylvania Transportation Claim Valuation*, Marshall Dennehey Client Seminar, September 2022
- *Continuing Impact of COVID-19 & Case Law Updates*, Marshall Dennehey Client Seminar, March 2022
- *Best Practices for Claim Log Notes*, Marshall Dennehey Client Seminar, June 2021
- *Special Damages in Auto and Trucking Claims in Pennsylvania*, Marshall Dennehey Client Seminar, January 2020
- *Arbitration – Practice and Procedure*, Marshall Dennehey Internal Presentation, June

2019

- *Social Media Evidence*, Marshall Dennehey Client Seminar, February 2017
- *Premises Liability Claims in Pennsylvania*, Client Seminar, June 2015
- *UIM/UM & Bad Faith Law Updates*, Client Seminar, May 2014

Published Works

- "Paul Miller's Law: Direct and Punitive Transportation Exposure," *CLM Magazine*, March 19, 2026
- "From Instagram to the Jury - Lessons in Digital Evidence Authentication," *PAMIC Pulse*, October 20, 2025
- "Pennsylvania's Expanding Vicarious Liability Standard," *The Legal Intelligencer*, February 27, 2025
- "The Impact of Recent Decisions on Gig Transportation Company Litigation in Pa.," *The Legal Intelligencer*, February 2, 2024
- "Unveiling the Power of Usage-Based Insurance in Personal Injury Discovery," *The Legal Intelligencer*, Personal Injury Supplement, November 7, 2023
- "Tracking the Truth: Utilizing App Data in Personal Injury Defense," *The Legal Intelligencer*, July 6, 2023
- Managing Liability for Videoconferencing While Driving, Risk Management Magazine, January 3, 2023
- "Pennsylvania Superior Court Ends Split of Authority Based on Allegations of Recklessness Within a Negligence Complaint," *Defense Digest*, Vol. 28, No. 12, December 2022
- Federal District Court Comments on Fair Share Act's Applicability In Cases Involving A "Faultless" Plaintiff in Light of Spencer V. Johnson, *Legal Update for Pennsylvania Civil Litigation*, July 13, 2022
- "Superior Court Reviews Discoverability of Mental Health Records," *Lawyers Journal*, April 8, 2022
- "Does the Fair Share Act Apply to Faultless Plaintiffs? A Defense Position in the Wake of Spencer v. Johnson," CounterPoint, newsletter of the PA Defense Institute, December 2021.
- "Pennsylvania Supreme Court Holds Sudden Emergency Doctrine No Longer a 'Defense'," *Defense Digest*, Vol. 27, No. 4, September 2021
- "Pennsylvania Superior Court Holds that Future Medical Expenses in Motor Vehicle Litigation Are Not Subject to Act VI Cost Containment Provisions," *Defense Digest*, Vol. 26, No. 1, March 2020
- "Social Media Discovery: Examining the Factual Predicate Standard," *The Legal Intelligencer*, March 5, 2016
- "Autonomous Vehicles May Impact Legal Profession," *Lawyers Journal*, October 2, 2015
- "Now You See It, Now You Don't: Self-Deleting Apps & Spoliation," *Lawyers Journal*, June 12, 2015 and *Defense Digest*, Vol. 21, No. 3, September 2015
- "Deposition Tips for Earning Respect as a Young Attorney," *The Legal Intelligencer*, March 12, 2015

Results

Successfully Defended a National Car-Sharing Company in a Multi-Party Suit

We successfully defended a national car-sharing company, resulting in a dismissal of all claims. The case involved a multi-party suit arising out of a commercial auto accident. Through aggressive pleading, we obtained a dismissal by arguing that both federal and state law provisions prohibited any claims against the car-sharing company.

Defense Shaves \$85K Demand to \$4K Jury Verdict in Personal Injury Case

The plaintiff claimed she sustained serious head and neck injuries following a two-car motor vehicle accident. At trial, we demonstrated that the plaintiff's alleged injuries were largely related to pre-accident and degenerative medical conditions. The defense also highlighted the fact this was the plaintiff's third personal injury lawsuit in a 15-year span. On the day of trial, the plaintiffs reduced their demand from \$85,000 to \$75,000. At the conclusion of trial, the jury returned a verdict of only \$4,000.

Summary Judgment Win on Behalf of Ohio Insurance Agent and Broker

The plaintiff, who owns a restaurant, sustained personal injuries in a car accident while on a business errand. He collected the tortfeasor's liability limits of \$100,000, and then filed underinsured motorist claims with his own insurance carrier who had issued the personal auto and commercial auto policies. The underinsured claims were denied by the carrier. There was no UIM coverage under the personal auto policy because the \$100,000 UIM limits equaled the liability carrier's limits. Further, although the plaintiff had \$1 million UIM limits on his commercial policy, the Mazda he was driving at the time of the accident was not listed on the commercial policy; rather, it was listed on the personal auto policy. The court granted our motion for summary judgment on several bases: the Statute of Limitations began to run when the Mazda was first put on the personal auto policy, not when the accident occurred; despite the plaintiff's and the agent's friendship and long-standing business dealings, there was not a fiduciary relationship between the agent and insured customer; and the agent's alleged statement to the plaintiff that he was covered in "every single possible way you can think of" did not amount to a misrepresentation of fact.

Thought Leadership

March 18, 2026

Paul Miller's Law: Direct and Punitive Transportation Exposure

October 1, 2025

From Instagram to the Jury: Lessons in Digital Evidence Authentication

February 27, 2025

Pennsylvania's Expanding Vicarious Liability Standard

February 2, 2024

The Impact of Recent Decisions on Gig Transportation Company Litigation in Pa.

December 1, 2023

Failure to Join Both Property Owners Leads to Case Dismissal*

November 2, 2023

Unveiling the Power of Usage-Based Insurance in Personal Injury Discovery

July 6, 2023

Tracking the Truth: Utilizing App Data in Personal Injury Defense

January 3, 2023

Managing Liability for Videoconferencing While Driving

December 1, 2022

Pennsylvania Superior Court Ends Split of Authority Based on Allegations of Recklessness Within a Negligence Complaint

July 13, 2022

Federal District Court Comments on Fair Share Act's Applicability in Cases Involving a "Faultless" Plaintiff in Light of Spencer v. Johnson

April 7, 2022

Superior Court Reviews Discoverability of Mental Health Records

December 1, 2021

Does the Fair Share Act Apply to Faultless Plaintiffs? A Defense Position In the Wake of Spencer v. Johnson

September 1, 2021

Pennsylvania Supreme Court Holds Sudden Emergency Doctrine No Longer a "Defense."