

Ryan Thomas Gannon

Shareholder

RTGannon@mdwccg.com

Roseland – 973.618.4115



Since joining Marshall Dennehey in 2012, Ryan's practice is primarily in the firm's Health Care Department. Ryan focuses his practice on medical, dental and nursing home malpractice. He has also represented nurses in New Jersey Board of Nursing matters and dentists in New Jersey Dental Board matters. Ryan is admitted to the New Jersey and New York State bars, as well as the United States District Court, District of New Jersey.

Following completion of law school at Seton Hall University, where he graduated *cum laude*, Ryan served as law clerk to the Honorable Ralph L. De Luccia, Jr, J.S.C., in the Civil Division of Passaic County. Since beginning his legal career, Ryan has concentrated his practice in medical malpractice defense.

Education

- Seton Hall University School of Law (J.D., *cum laude*, 2008)
- University of Maryland (B.A., 2005)

Admissions

- New Jersey, 2008
- U.S. District Court District of New Jersey, 2008
- New York, 2009

Honors & Awards

- New Jersey Super Lawyers Rising Star (2014-2023)

The Super Lawyers list is issued by Thomson Reuters. A description of the selection methodology can be found [here](#). No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey.

Associations & Memberships

Practices

- Medical Malpractice
- Dental Malpractice
- Long-Term Care Liability

- New Jersey State Bar Association
 - Passaic County Bar Association
-

Results

No-Cause Jury Verdict Secured in Wrongful Death Trial

We successfully obtained a no-cause jury verdict in a 13-day wrongful death trial. The decedent, a 59-year-old man, was admitted to the emergency room on February 15, 2019, with complaints of abdominal pain, decreased appetite, and constipation, despite the use of laxatives. The patient did not complain of any nausea, vomiting, or diarrhea. He had a significant medical history including diabetes, hypertension, prior coronary artery stenting, morbid obesity (with past gastric bypass surgery), longstanding ventral hernia, and back pain. A CT scan revealed multiple hernias and a potential closed-loop bowel obstruction, leading to a surgery consultation. Our client, an emergency general surgeon, interpreted that the patient did not have a closed loop or any significant obstruction and recommended non-surgical management. The patient was approved to have clear liquids, and had a vomiting incident shortly after, but our client was not notified. The patient was returned to NPO status, and after improving overnight, he was returned to “clears” and additional medical and renal consults were ordered. Our client did not receive any communications from the residents/nurses of any changes in the patient’s condition. On February 18, 2019, two rapid responses were called due to increased heart rate and vomiting. It is believed that the vomiting resulted in aspiration, causing sepsis, ultimately leading to the patient’s death. During the trial, the plaintiff’s sole medical expert highlighted imaging on the wrong hernia, which called into question all of his opinions in the case. We made key objections related to the expert testimony, limiting what the allegations were, and preventing new allegations from being made. After approximately two and a half hours of deliberating, the jury returned a no-cause verdict.

Won Unanimous Defense Verdict in High-Exposure Birth Injury Case

We secured a unanimous defense verdict in a high-exposure birth injury case, successfully proving that our client’s obstetric care met accepted standards despite claims of negligence and lasting injury.

The plaintiff, the mother, alleged the obstetrician defendant was negligent in failing to identify her baby as large for gestational age in the prenatal period, in failing to proceed with a cesarean section during the labor, and in negligently performing a forceps delivery. The plaintiff alleged, as a result of her injuries from the delivery, she suffered pelvic organ prolapse, incontinence, and ongoing pain and suffering. The plaintiff underwent two subsequent gynecologic surgeries and alleged, as result of her ongoing pain, she would never be able to return to work for the remainder of her life. Through the testimony of our client and experts, we were able to establish the care provided by the obstetrician was within accepted standards of care and the decision to proceed with the delivery as performed was the safest option for the mother and baby. The jury returned a unanimous verdict in favor of our client.

Received a Unanimous Defense Verdict in a High-Exposure Birth Injury Case

We received a unanimous defense verdict for their client in a high-exposure birth injury case. The plaintiff, the mother, alleged the obstetrician defendant was negligent in failing to identify her baby as large for gestational age in the prenatal period, in failing to proceed with a cesarean section during the labor, and in negligently performing a forceps delivery. The plaintiff alleged, as a result of her injuries from the delivery, she suffered pelvic organ prolapse, incontinence, and ongoing pain and suffering. The plaintiff underwent two subsequent gynecologic surgeries and alleged, as result of her ongoing pain, she would never be able to return to work for the remainder of her life. Through the testimony of our client and experts, we were able to establish the care provided by the obstetrician was within accepted standards of care and the decision to proceed with the delivery as performed was the safest option for the mother and baby. The jury returned a unanimous verdict in favor of our client.

Obtained Defense Verdict in Complex Medical Malpractice Action

We won a defense verdict in a complex New Jersey medical malpractice trial, defeating claims that surgical negligence caused severe complications, after undermining the plaintiff's case through expert cross-examination and strong defense testimony.

We obtained a defense verdict in a complex medical malpractice case after a two-week jury trial in New Jersey. The elderly plaintiff claimed his posterior lumbar laminectomy for decompression was negligently performed. It was alleged that care failures in the performance of surgery caused a loss of bowel and bladder control that ultimately required an irreversible colostomy and placement of a suprapubic catheter, as well as subsequent infections requiring extended medical intervention and rehabilitative care. The plaintiffs also made a claim for lack of informed consent for an alleged failure of the physician to inform the plaintiff regarding the risks of the subject surgery, which was thrown out by the court at trial. The defense was successful in obtaining favorable admissions from the plaintiff's expert during cross-examination, and the strength of the defense's standard of care expert testimony was convincing to the jury, resulting in a defense verdict.

Unanimous Defense Verdict in Medical Malpractice Case

We secured a unanimous defense verdict in a three-week medical malpractice trial involving an allegedly botched total knee replacement. Through the testimony of our client and an expert, we were able to establish that all accepted standards of care were met. The jury deliberated for three days before returning its unanimous verdict.