



Daniel R. Coffman

Of Counsel

daniel.coffman@wilsonelser.com

Washington, DC – 202.626.7669

Daniel Coffman litigates complex, leading-edge cases with a focus on class actions and other civil litigation. Dan has experience defending against a variety of state and nationwide class actions, including consumer privacy cases. His experience includes litigating claims under the California Confidentiality of Medical Information Act (CCMIA), California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), and numerous other state consumer privacy statutes. Dan also has many years of experience representing businesses in connection with contract and business tort claims.

Dan works with clients to prepare and implement comprehensive defense strategies in response to litigation. He zealously litigates his cases but also takes a common sense, business-centered approach in assessing the best strategy for each case.

Dan has experience in all phases of litigation, including electronic discovery, motion practice, alternative dispute resolution, trial and appeal.

Prior to joining Wilson Elser, Dan worked at a Midwest firm where he represented businesses as both plaintiff and defendant in complex commercial and general liability cases.

During law school, Dan was awarded the Ike Skelton Sr. Prize for best work in trial practice. He also clerked for the Honorable Gary Witt, Missouri Court of Appeals.

Cybersecurity & Data Breach Class Actions

Dan has represented and defended businesses in data breach class actions filed in state and federal courts across the country. Dan regularly files dispositive motions, works with clients in developing a strategy for responding to discovery and, where appropriate, assists clients in reaching a negotiated resolution of class claims.

Services

- Class Action
- Commercial Litigation
- Complex Tort & General Casualty
- Cybersecurity & Data Privacy
- Medical Malpractice & Health Care
- Appellate
- Professional Liability & Services

Class Action Defense

Dan has represented businesses in class action litigation involving consumer protection statutes, debt collection laws, breach of contract and product liability claims. Dan aggressively defends clients by filing dispositive motions, discovery motions and oppositions to class certification.

Appellate

Dan has successfully litigated appeals in state and federal courts across the country. He drafts persuasive appellate briefs and meticulously prepares for oral argument before appellate panels.

Commercial Litigation

Dan has represented individuals and businesses, as both plaintiff and defendant, in complex commercial litigation. For instance, Dan has represented clients in matters involving contractual disputes, intellectual property disputes and struggles over corporate control.

Complex Tort & General Casualty

Dan has defended construction companies, property owners and management companies in all manner of premises liability and negligence claims.

Education

- University of Missouri School of Law (J.D., 2014)
 - Note and Comment Editor, Missouri Law Review
- William Jewell College (B.A., *with honors*, 2009)

Bar Admissions

- Missouri
- District of Columbia
- Maryland

Court Admissions

- U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit
- U.S. District Court, District of Columbia

Awards & Honors

- Selected for inclusion in *The Best Lawyers in America*®, 2025-2026
- Selected for inclusion in Washington D.C. Super Lawyers® Rising Stars™, 2023-2024

Representative Matters

Prevailed on a motion to dismiss a “total loss” class action in Wisconsin. The case was

appealed but dismissed with prejudice by plaintiff following the filing of the respondent's brief.

Represented numerous businesses in data breach class actions in state and federal court across the country.

Represented a software as a service (SaaS) company in a contract dispute with one of its customers.

Persuaded D.C. Circuit to affirm district court's dismissal of plaintiff's claim based on lack of personal jurisdiction.

Successfully enforced judgment for trademark infringement such that infringing party was held in contempt, forced to take down infringing content, and ordered to pay client's attorneys' fees and costs.

Obtained summary judgment on behalf of a pool contractor where plaintiffs alleged damage to their multimillion-dollar home arising from the design and installation of an inadequate heating and cooling system in their natatorium. Summary judgment was affirmed on appeal.

Persuaded the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals to affirm the district court's denial of a temporary restraining order and award of attorney's fees in a corporate governance case.

Persuaded the Missouri Court of Appeals to reverse the trial court's judgment on a quiet title action.

Obtained partial summary judgment as plaintiff in a subrogation case involving the collapse of one of the largest cranes in North America.

Successfully represented homeowners, landlords and Fortune 500 companies in premises liability suits, including serving as first chair in a jury trial in which the jury awarded less than 10% of plaintiff's last pre-trial offer.

Client Wins

D.C. Class Action Team Prevails on Motion for Reconsideration: Court Concedes It Committed Clear Error in Certifying a Class Action

Washington, D.C. partners David Ross and Kevin P. Farrell and associate Daniel Coffman secured a rare acknowledgement from the District of Columbia Superior Court, which conceded it committed a clear error in previously certifying a class in a case related to vehicle repossession practices. The court had found that proposed class members suffered similar injuries based on an alleged practice of overcharging for repossession and vehicle storage and other actions taken after a customer's default. Wilson Elser filed a motion contending that the court did not address issues presented in its Opposition to Class Certification. The court agreed, finding that a class cannot be certified for several reasons: (1) plaintiff lacks standing because her claims are based entirely on past

conduct; (2) plaintiff cannot serve as class representative or a member of a class because her claims are time-barred; (3) arbitration and class waiver clauses in the plaintiff's and proposed class member's contracts preclude class certification; and (4) the court's *sua sponte* reliance on a municipal regulation was misplaced.

Farrell and Coffman Secure Dismissal of All Claims Against Military Defense Contractor

Kevin Farrell (Partner-Washington, DC) and Daniel Coffman (Associate-Washington, DC) prevailed on a motion to dismiss on behalf of a United States military defense contractor after a plaintiff attempted to add the contractor to a suit regarding the loss of plaintiff's security clearance. The motion to dismiss demonstrated that the tortious interference and other claims against Wilson Elser's client were barred by the statute of limitations. The plaintiff argued that several exceptions applied, including that his claims were timely because the D.C. Superior Court's COVID-19 orders tolled the statute of limitations. While noting that the relevant orders were not a model of clarity, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia agreed with Dan and Kevin's concise analysis of the D.C. Superior Court's COVID-19 orders, and found that the claims were time-barred. The court further determined that (1) the continuous tort doctrine does not apply to the plaintiff's claims, (2) the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure's joinder rules have no bearing on whether the plaintiff's claims are timely, and (3) under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15 the plaintiff's claims did not "relate back" to his first complaint because his failure to timely add the contractor as a defendant was not the type of mistake Rule 15 was meant to remedy. All claims against Wilson Elser's client were dismissed with prejudice.

Coffman, Das, Ross, Viergever and Williams Defeat Federal Data Breach Class Action

Daniel Coffman (Associate-Washington, DC), Anjali Das (Partner-Chicago, IL), David Ross (Partner-Washington, DC), Kim Viergever (Of Counsel-Denver, CO) and Ryan Williams (Partner-Denver, CO) obtained dismissal with prejudice of a federal data breach class action filed against a services vendor for mental health care providers in the District of Colorado. The case comprised eight consolidated class actions brought by 15 named plaintiffs that arose out of a ransomware incident that involved the personal information of almost 4.3 million individuals and included sensitive information such as health information and Social Security numbers. The court agreed that all of the named plaintiffs lack Article III standing, dissecting each of their alleged theories of harm and coming down on the side of the more reasoned courts that have found these types of theories fail to establish standing – public disclosure of private information, increased spam, diminution in value of PHI/PII, emotional distress and future harm. The court concluded that "Plaintiffs have failed to allege injuries in fact that are fairly traceable to the Defendants' complained-of conduct," and issued a judgment dismissing the plaintiffs' claims with prejudice and closing the case.

Publications

July 7, 2025

Testing the Limits: D.C. Court of Appeals Clarifies Tester Standing in CPPA Cases

March 2024

Bloomberg Law Publishes Ross and Coffman Article under Practical Guidance

Bloomberg Law / Practical Guidance