

William J. Murphy

Associate

WJMurphy@mdwcg.com

Roseland – 973.618.4129



William (Bill) practices solely in the firm's Workers' Compensation Department. He has 10 years of experience in defending clients in workers' compensation matters. Throughout his career, Bill has represented insured and self-insured entities, including those in the retail, restaurant, grocery, transportation and manufacturing industries.

Bill has built his practice based upon zealous advocacy, meticulous attention to detail, and frequent communication with both clients and adversaries to bring each case to a prompt and satisfactory conclusion.

Bill is an active member of the New Jersey legal community. He serves as a volunteer Court Appointed Special Advocate, and provides pro bono services for St. Anne's Center, a women's shelter in Phillipsburg, New Jersey.

A graduate of St. Peter's University, Bill received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Theology and Philosophy with a minor in history. During his undergraduate studies, Bill was a member of several honor societies and received an award as outstanding member of his graduating class. Bill subsequently earned his juris doctor from Rutgers Law School. While attending Rutgers, he was the founding president of the St. Thomas More Society and the ABA Representative for the Student Bar Association.

Education

- Rutgers Law School (J.D., 2010)
- Saint Peter's University (B.A., 2005)

Admissions

- New Jersey, 2010
- U.S. District Court District of New Jersey, 2010
- New York, 2023

Practices

- Workers' Compensation Defense

Associations & Memberships

- Christian Legal Society
- New Jersey State Bar Association
- New York Self-Insurers Association
- New York State Bar Association
- Warren County Bar Association

Representative Cases & Matters

- Successfully dismissed a New Jersey workers' compensation claim involving allegations of a decade-long occupational exposure. The claimant alleged orthopedic, neurologic, and pulmonary disabilities arising from the exposure. After the claimant's counsel failed to take the necessary steps to advance the matter, we pursued dismissal for lack of prosecution. The court granted the request, bringing the claim to a complete and favorable conclusion.
- Successfully secured the dismissal with prejudice of two New Jersey workers' compensation medical provider applications seeking a combined \$71,534. The applications arose from medical treatment allegedly related to a workplace injury, and we challenged the claims on jurisdictional grounds, arguing that the underlying accident occurred in New York and lacked a sufficient connection to New Jersey. Despite the two matters being assigned to different judges of compensation, both judges agreed with the jurisdictional argument and entered orders dismissing the respective claims with prejudice, thereby eliminating all claim exposure.

Published Works

- "[Marijuana Legalization and Workplace Risk: What New Jersey Employers Need to Know,](#)" *New Jersey Law Journal*, May 21, 2026
 - "[Medical Marijuana in New Jersey Workers' Compensation Law,](#)" *New Jersey Law Journal*, July 11, 2025
 - "[The Implications of Remote Work on Workers' Compensation,](#)" *New Jersey Law Journal*, June 2023
 - "[Under the Influence of the Intoxication Defense: Differing State Laws Can Affect Workers' Compensation Claims for Workplace Injuries,](#)" *CLM Magazine*, April 2023
 - "[To Be or Not To Be: The Independent Contractor Versus Employee Debate Continues,](#)" *CLM Magazine*, December 2022
-

Results

Dismissals on the Rise! Our New Jersey Workers' Compensation attorneys are successful in precluding litigation

Lela Eke received a Dismiss Without Prejudice for Lack of Prosecution, after filing a Motion to Dismiss in response to numerous discovery requests that remained unanswered. At the hearing, Petitioner's counsel was unable to provide an explanation for the delay. We argued that keeping the case open to give them more time to respond

to our discovery and Motion would be prejudicial against us, and the Court granted our Motion.

Jessica Gordon received a dismissal for lack of prosecution in a case where the claim was denied with ongoing request for medical treatment, but there had been no report from the Petitioner to support the request and no demand was made in lieu of litigation.

William Murphy successfully obtained an order for dismissal for a claim involving a workplace assault. In the case, the Petitioner alleged injuries to their neck, back, chest, and right hand following an assault at work. After the Petitioner missed multiple independent medical exams scheduled by the employer, we filed a motion to dismiss this claim for lack of prosecution. The judge of compensation granted the motion.

Rachel Ramsay-Lowe was successful in defending a case where the Petitioner was not complying with discovery requests and did not appear for Respondent's permanency evaluation. We filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Prosecution and the Court entered the dismissal Order.

Kristy Salvitti was successful in obtaining an Order for Dismissal where the Petitioner had filed a Reopener of a Clam Petition relative to a prior permanency award arguing that disability to his right shoulder, thoracic and lumbar spine had increased to permanent and total disability. If successful, Petitioner would receive lifetime related medical treatment and 450 weeks to life of his temporary total disability rate. However, following oral argument that Petitioner failed to timely prosecute the claim, the Reopener Petitioner was dismissed.

Obtained Dismissal with Prejudice in Complex Workers' Compensation Case

We obtained orders for dismissal, with prejudice, where four New Jersey medical providers alleged they were entitled to additional monies for medical treatment provided in New Jersey to a New York resident. The underlying accident involved a laborer who resided in New York, worked in New York and sustained the injuries in New York. Four medical providers filed medical provider claims against the employer in New Jersey, seeking more than \$800,000 from the employer for treatment rendered in relation to this accident. We filed motions to dismiss these claims for lack of jurisdiction, asserting there were insufficient contacts with the state of New Jersey to establish jurisdiction. The judge of compensation ruled in favor of the employer, dismissing the four medical providers' applications with prejudice.

Permanently Closed a Matter Involving a Serious Shoulder Injury With a Section 20 Resolution

We were able to permanently close a matter involving a serious shoulder injury with a Section 20 resolution. In this case, the petitioner sustained significant injuries to her shoulder with an MRI showing tearing. The petitioner ultimately underwent two shoulder surgeries, and our own permanency expert found permanent disability of 7.5% partial total. Based upon wage statements we obtained, he asserted that any permanency award should be paid at a reduced rate—making the monetary award about \$40,000 less than what would be paid at the full chart rate. When the judge attempted to have the

parties settle for a higher percentage of disability—to make up for the lower rate—we indicated our intent to take the matter to trial. In order to avoid a trial, the judge indicated he would approve a Section 20 settlement. Thus, in an admitted claim involving serious injuries, two surgeries and our own doctor conceding permanency, we were able to close the matter out permanently with a Section 20 resolution.

Workers' comp claim dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and coverage for an occupational accident policy carrier.

The petitioner filed a claim petition within the New Jersey Division of Workers' Compensation seeking benefits and alleging employment with a trucking company. However, the petitioner had previously obtained an occupational accident policy in the role of an independent contractor. When filing the workers' compensation petition, counsel for the petitioner erroneously named the occupational accident policy carrier as carrier for the trucking company. Although it would appear clear that jurisdiction and coverage do not exist in such cases, most times it is a lengthy process to have such matters addressed by the court and ultimately dismissed. In this case, we were successful in obtaining the dismissal and ceasing further unnecessary financial costs to the client.

Thought Leadership

June 30, 2026

Don't Waive Goodbye to Your Section 40 Lien Rights

May 21, 2026

Marijuana Legalization and Workplace Risk: What New Jersey Employers Need to Know

July 11, 2025

Medical Marijuana in New Jersey Workers' Compensation Law

June 6, 2023

The Implications of Remote Work on Workers' Compensation

June 1, 2023

New Jersey Legislative Update

April 1, 2023

Under the Influence of the Intoxication Defense: Differing State Laws Can Affect Workers' Compensation Claims for Workplace Injuries

December 1, 2022

To Be or Not To Be: The Independent Contractor vs. Employee Debate Continues

November 23, 2022

What's Hot in Workers' Comp – Special NJ Alert