
Travis C. Talbot

Associate

TCTalbot@mdwccg.com

Philadelphia – 215.575.2692



As a member of the Health Care Department, Travis defends physicians, physician's assistants, hospitals, long-term care facilities, dentists, and other health care providers in professional and general liability cases. He also handles catastrophic litigation matters relating to product liability, premises liability, and workplace accidents.

Travis began his legal career as a public defender in Manhattan, where he tried numerous jury trials to verdict as lead counsel and attained full acquittals throughout his seven-year tenure. Travis then became the Principal Court Attorney to Justice Robert Mandelbaum of the New York State Supreme Court in New York County, overseeing 50+ felony trials and hundreds of suppression hearings while also drafting opinions and providing legal research. Both roles provided Travis with invaluable insight into trial practice, motion writing, legal research, and judicial decision-making.

Prior to joining Marshall Dennehey, Travis was an associate attorney at a national law firm in New York where he also defended health care providers in cases involving complex issues of medical malpractice. In this role, Travis gained experience in working up high-value, civil litigation matters from inception through summary judgment motion practice.

Travis was born and raised in Montgomery County and received his BA in Journalism and Political Science at Penn State. He then graduated *cum laude* from Wake Forest University School of Law, where he was the Manuscripts Editor of the *Wake Forest Journal of Business and Intellectual Property Law*.

When he is not in the office, Travis enjoys spending time with his family, friends and dog, as well as going to concerts.

Practices

- Medical Malpractice

Education

- Wake Forest University School of Law (J.D., *cum laude*, 2011)
- The Pennsylvania State University (B.A., *with honors*, 2008)

Admissions

- New York, 2012
- Pennsylvania, 2024
- U.S. District Court Southern District of New York, 2025
- U.S. District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 2025

Published Works

- "Sealing Law is Step in Right Direction," *New York Law Journal*, June 2017
-

Results

Defense Verdict Secured in a Dental Malpractice Action

We received a defense verdict in a dental malpractice action before the Luzerne County Court of Common Pleas. The plaintiff had a history of issues with his third molars (wisdom teeth) beginning in 2012. In 2013, he was referred to have one of them extracted by a prior dentist. In October 2015, the plaintiff presented to our client for a broken tooth. During the exam, our client advised him that he needed to have all four of his third molars removed. He even suggested it needed to be done at the next visit. However, the plaintiff did not schedule any further appointments. On January 10, 2017, the plaintiff presented with an infected third molar on the lower right. Our client suggested extracting both third molars on the right, as all of his third molars were broken down and sources of infection, but the plaintiff would only allow extraction of the lower tooth. The dentist extracted the tooth, gave a prescription of amoxicillin, and administered two loading doses to get the antibiotic to therapeutic levels more quickly. He also told the plaintiff to call if the swelling in his face did not improve or if it got worse. Over the next four days, his swelling got worse every day, but he did not call the dentist. Finally, on January 14, 2017, his swelling had progressed into his neck, and he called our client, who saw him and immediately sent him to the emergency department. He was admitted to the hospital for 40 days, was intubated, underwent 11 procedures, including multiple incision and drainage procedures, placement of a PEG tube, and a tracheostomy. The plaintiff's experts agreed that a patient has responsibility for his own care, and failing to have his teeth extracted, or calling the doctor when the situation got worse, contributed to his injury. Although contributory negligence was on the verdict slip, the jury never got to the question as they found our client was not negligent.