



Jeffrey J. Hines

jjh@gdldlaw.com
(410) 783-4041 (phone)
(410) 783-4040 (fax)



Goodell, DeVries, Leech & Dann, LLP

Goodell, DeVries, Leech & Dann, LLP • One South Street • 20th Floor • Baltimore, Maryland 21202

PROFILE

Mr. Hines joined the firm as a partner in 2003. He was formerly the managing principal of a regional law firm's District of Columbia and Virginia offices. Mr. Hines is licensed in Maryland, the District of Columbia and Virginia, and has represented clients in trials and appeals in all three jurisdictions. His areas of practice include professional malpractice, toxic tort and environmental, pharmaceutical, products liability, and commercial, securities and employee litigation. Mr. Hines is listed in Best Lawyers in America under legal malpractice law, in Super Lawyers under products liability and in The Best of the U.S.

Professional Malpractice Litigation. Mr. Hines defends attorneys, health care providers, realtors, clergy, social workers and other professionals in malpractice claims brought in Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia. In 2008, Mr. Hines successfully tried a will construction case in the Circuit Court for Montgomery County, Maryland. In 2005, Mr. Hines convinced a federal judge in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to apply Virginia law regarding the non-assignability of legal malpractice claims substantially reducing an insurance company's claims against its panel counsel. In 2004, Mr. Hines obtained a defense verdict in Maryland for an accountant who allegedly provided improper tax advice. In December 2003, Mr. Hines successfully tried a wrongful adoption matter involving allegations of child trafficking and brain damage in the Circuit Court for Montgomery County, Maryland. Mr. Hines was able to strike plaintiff's expert neuropsychologist for basing his opinion on unreliable data. At his prior firm, Mr. Hines obtained a defense verdict after a three week jury trial in a sexual abuse case brought against a psychologist in the Circuit Court for Fairfax County, Virginia. In addition, Mr. Hines obtained a defense verdict in a multi-million dollar case against an attorney brought in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. Mr. Hines has also defended attorneys and health care providers in matters before disciplinary boards. As a service to his clients, Mr. Hines provides in-house educational seminars to professionals to assist them in avoiding claims.

Pharmaceutical and Products Liability Litigation. Mr. Hines represents Astra Zeneca in the Seroquel and Pain Pump litigations. Mr. Hines has represented Pfizer, Inc. in the Neurontin, Celebrex and Mirapex litigations. Mr. Hines was part of the national team representing Wyeth in Fen-Phen litigation. At his prior firm, Mr. Hines handled a variety of product liability claims involving products ranging from contact lenses to light industrial lifts. Mr. Hines also was Scottsdale Insurance Company's national coverage counsel for claims arising out of the national firearms product liability litigation.

Toxic Tort and Environmental Litigation. Mr. Hines is a member of the GDLD team coordinating a major sand supplier's national defense of silicosis claims. Mr. Hines oversees expert development, conducts training seminars for defense counsel, coordinates discovery, oversees settlement negotiations, and participates on trial teams.

Commercial, Securities and Employee Litigation. Mr. Hines is currently defending broker-dealers in cases filed with the FINRA. Mr. Hines prepares responses to the FINRA's Enforcement Department and defends broker-dealers and registered representatives in Rule 8210 examinations and in customer initiated arbitrations. In December 2004, after a three day arbitration, Mr. Hines obtained a defense verdict on behalf of a broker-dealer and registered representative, including an expungement directive. Mr. Hines also represents a major credit company and has defended them in multiple suits filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia (Richmond division). For over ten years, Mr. Hines was national counsel for Parents Without Partners, Inc., the largest single parent organization in the world whose members at one time exceeded 250,000. In his capacity as national counsel, Mr. Hines attended all board of director meetings and served on the executive committee. Mr. Hines handled employment claims, prepared all corporate filings, dealt directly with

the Internal Revenue Service on 501(c)(3) issues, advised the board as to its duties and responsibilities and prepared or reviewed all contracts. Mr. Hines also lectured throughout the United States at local chapters regarding their legal and ethical obligations and assisted local counsel in the defense of claims filed against the corporation. Mr. Hines also represents corporations regarding compliance with ethical obligations.

EDUCATION

University of Maryland School of Law (J.D., with Honors, 1985)

University of Maryland (B.S., Economics, 1981)

COURT ADMISSIONS

- United States District Court, District of Maryland, 1987
- United States District Court, District of Columbia, 1988
- United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, 1998
- United States District Court, Eastern District of Virginia, 2002
- United States Bankruptcy Court, Eastern District of Virginia, 2006

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

- Maryland State Bar Association
- Defense Research Institute
- American Bar Association, Section of Litigation, Mass Torts Litigation Committee

BAR MEMBERSHIPS

- Maryland State Bar, 1985
- District of Columbia Bar, 1986
- Virginia State Bar, 1999

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Goodell, DeVries, Leech & Dann, LLP, Partner, 2003

Eccleston and Wolf, P.C., Managing Principal, District of Columbia office, 1997

Eccleston and Wolf, P.C., Principal, 1990

Eccleston and Wolf, P.C., Associate, 1985

REPORTED CASES

Moore v. Nissan Motor Acceptance Corp., 376 Md. 558, 831 A.2d 12 (Md. 2003). The Court interpreting Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 22 reversed the trial court's dismissal of a debtor's claim finding that it was not barred by the doctrine of res judicata.

Chrisher v. Bethune, 749 A.2d 130 (D.C. 2000)

Court of Appeals held that a client may bring a legal malpractice case against an attorney based on an attorney's alleged admission of fault even without expert testimony.

Sherman v. Adoption Center of Washington, 791 A.2d 1031 (D.C. 1999)

Court of Appeals affirmed entry of summary judgment in a wrongful adoption case.

Kerby v. Mortgage Funding Corp., 992 F. Supp. 787, RICO Bus. Disp. Guide 9465 (D. Md. 1998)

Class action was brought by homeowners against a financial institution, title insurance company and others alleging conspiracy. The district court held that the alleged criminal violations of RESPA could not serve as predicate acts for purpose of establishing a RICO violation.

Ferenc v. World Child, Inc., 172 F.3d 919 (D.C. Cir. 1998)

Court of Appeals for District of Columbia Circuit affirmed trial court's entry of summary judgment finding that a contractual waiver clause did not violate public policy.

Fred Ezra Co. v. Psychiatric Institute of Washington, 687 A.2d 587 (D.C. 1996)

Court of Appeals reversed in part and affirmed in part the trial court's entry of summary judgment. The appellate court found that material issues of fact existed as to whether the statute of limitations was tolled through fraudulent concealment.

Mills v. Cooter, 647 A.2d 1118 (D.C. 1994)

Legal malpractice claim alleging failure to sue proper parties. Reversed on appeal finding that an attorney is not liable for refusing to bring a claim that the attorney in good faith believes lacks merit.

Friendly Mobile Manor v. Levan, Schimel, Richman and Belman, P.A.,

93 Md. App. 337, 612 A.2d 322 (Md. App. 1992) Legal malpractice claim alleging breach of duty in the sale of a mobile home park. Appellate court affirmed trial court's entry of judgment finding that "of counsel" designation in letterhead does not establish apparent agency.

Pickett, Houlon & Berman v. Hoslip, 73 Md. App. 89, 533 A.2d 287 (Md. App. 1987)

Legal malpractice case arising out of underlying divorce case. Appellate court held that a properly instructed jury can determine equitable claims.