

Vlada Tasich

Co-Chair, Product Liability Practice

Chair, Class Action Litigation Practice

VXTasich@mdwcg.com

Philadelphia – 215.575.2659



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 over twenty years. As co-chair of the firm's Product Liability Practice, Vlada was recently recognized by *Chambers USA* with a Band Two ranking in the area of product liability defense in Pennsylvania. 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 is also 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.

Education

- The Catholic University of America Columbus School of Law (J.D., 2001)
- The George Washington University (B.A., 1997)

Admissions

Practices

- Product Liability
- First-Party Property
- Trucking & Transportation Liability
- Construction Injury Litigation
- Class Action Litigation
- Miscellaneous Professional Liability
- Catastrophic Claims Litigation

- 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, 2013

Honors & Awards

- Chambers USA, Pennsylvania: Litigation: Product Liability, Band 2 (2025-2026)
- Pennsylvania Super Lawyers (2015-2026)
- Pennsylvania Super Lawyers Rising Star (2010-2012)

Associations & Memberships

- Defense Research Institute (DRI)
- Pennsylvania Bar Association
- Product Liability Advisory Council (PLAC)

Classes/Seminars Taught

- *Social Inflation*, Marshall Dennehey Client Seminar, June 21, 2022
- *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

Significant Representative Matters

- Successfully obtained dismissal of a wrongful death action against a product manufacturer and distributor for lack of personal jurisdiction. The case involved allegations of a defective windshield installed in Pennsylvania, but the defense team demonstrated that the clients—located in Ohio and South Carolina—lacked sufficient contacts with the forum state, overcoming the plaintiff's stream-of-commerce jurisdiction theory.
- Prevailed on a Motion to Dismiss in a data breach class action in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Sixteen named plaintiffs brought claims alleging that a hacker had accessed the personal information of over 1,000,000 individuals nationwide. We defended the debt collection company whose computer servers were compromised. Plaintiffs asserted broad and novel legal theories, including negligent failure to protect data, breach of implied contract, invasion of privacy, negligence per se, and violations of various state consumer protection laws. We successfully contested these claims, resulting in the dismissal of eight plaintiffs for lack of standing and 15 of the 17 asserted causes of action being dismissed.
- 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.

- Obtained a dismissal with prejudice of a products liability case filed against an alcohol beverage manufacturer. The Plaintiffs are individuals who were seriously injured or killed when the alleged minor drunk driver of the vehicle in which they were passengers was involved in a single car accident. The Plaintiffs claimed that the manufacturer was liable to them because the product had more alcohol than other alcohol beverages, was improperly marketed to minors, like their driver, and did not warn of the dangers associated with the beverage. Our team argued several points including that Pennsylvania does not recognize such a products liability cause of action because the dangers of drinking alcohol and driving are obvious, and the manufacturer has no duty to warn potential users of such dangers. Additionally, alcohol is not an unreasonably dangerous product.
- 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.

Results

Summary Judgment Won in a Pennsylvania Premises Liability Case

We secured summary judgment in a premises liability case in Northampton County, Pennsylvania, dismissing all claims against a national sporting goods retailer. The plaintiff claimed he slipped and fell on a slippery substance inside a the store while testing out bicycles. The plaintiff and his wife admitted that after he fell, they did not inspect the floor and quickly left the store. Months later, and after filing suit, the plaintiff and an engineer visited the store and claimed that there was an open can of bicycle grease in the area where the fall had occurred. Based on this evidence alone, the plaintiff

theorized, through an expert report, that he must have fallen on bicycle grease negligently left on the floor by the store staff. Summary judgment was sought on the grounds that no witnesses to the fall ever actually identified any substance on the floor, and that the expert's opinion was based on pure speculation. The court agreed and dismissed all claims against our client.

Dismissal with Prejudice Obtained in Case Targeting Alcoholic Beverage

Manufacturer

We secured a dismissal with prejudice in a product liability case in Pennsylvania. The plaintiffs, who were involved, but not responsible, for a drunk driving accident, claimed that the beverage manufacturer was liable to them because the product had more alcohol than other alcoholic beverages and was improperly marketed to minors. Our team successfully argued several points, including that Pennsylvania does not recognize such a product liability cause of action because the dangers of drinking alcohol and driving are obvious, and the manufacturer has no duty to warn potential users of such dangers.

Defense Prevails in Workplace Injury/Premises Liability Case

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). A connection between components broke, and a metal pan fell on the plaintiff's arm, crushing it. The plaintiff alleged he had previously reported the problem to the defendants. Our attorneys successfully argued that the defendant who owned the property was a "landlord out of possession" and not responsible for injuries to third parties on the premises. The plaintiff argued that his complaint to one defendant about the equipment problem was notice to both, because both companies were owned by the same family. The court ruled that the shared ownership of the companies did not impose a legal duty on a defendant that was not otherwise responsible for the property.

Summary Judgment in Class Action Lawsuit On Behalf of Large Insurer

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. Per the insurer's request, the court agreed to stay class action discovery so that the insurer could file a dispositive motion as to the named plaintiffs, which, if granted, would dispose of the entire putative class action case. In its motion for summary judgment, the insurer argued that the named plaintiffs could not meet their individual burdens of proof since it was undisputed they had a rental vehicle for 23 days and had returned the rental the same day they picked up their newly purchased vehicle. The court agreed and granted the insurer's motion for summary judgment in its entirety and dismissed the action. The court reasoned, in part, that the named plaintiffs' alleged damages were speculative and that issuance of the rental letter

did not constitute a breach of the policy since the plaintiffs could not show that they were not afforded benefits to which they were entitled.

Thought Leadership

December 1, 2021

On the Pulse...Our Product Liability Practice Group