



David I. Umansky

Associate

david.umansky@wilsonelser.com

New York, NY – 212.915.5165

David Umansky handles a range of general and complex liability matters, with a focus on premises liability, construction and transportation.

Prior to joining Wilson Elser, David worked at a renowned boutique law firm in New York City, specializing in commercial litigation. While there, he handled significant aspects of a wide range of matters including general commercial disputes, leisure and hospitality litigation, and defense of one of America's largest nonprofit organizations.

Education

- Albany Law School (J.D., *cum laude*, 2022)
 - Executive Editor, Symposium - Albany Law Review
 - Best Brief, Domenick L. Gabrielli Appellate Advocacy Competition
- Rutgers University (B.A., *magna cum laude*, 2017)

Bar Admissions

- New York

Languages

- Romanian

Services

- Complex Tort & General Casualty
- Transportation
- Construction

Client Wins

Ross and Umansky Achieve Outstanding Result in High-Stakes Bronx County Labor

Law Trial

Mathew Ross (Partner-White Plains) and David Umansky (Associate -New York, NY), assisted by paralegal Martha Chavez and firm interns Jessica Pizzi and Francesca Rocha, secured an outstanding result in Bronx Supreme Court, New York, on behalf of a construction company client after a nearly four-week trial featuring 13 witnesses, including nine experts. The plaintiff, a union bricklayer, alleged that he fell from one scaffold level to the level below, sustaining significant injuries, and was taken to the hospital via ambulance. He had a two-level cervical fusion surgery, a single-level lumbar fusion surgery, and the right ankle injury required no surgery. During the trial, the jury found that while the plaintiff did fall from a bicycle scaffold to the scaffold below, Mat and David's proximate cause arguments, asserting that the fall was not the proximate cause of the plaintiff's cervical fusion or ankle injuries, were compelling, and limited proximate cause to the lumbar spine injury only. Despite a \$13.5 million demand at the start of trial and plaintiff's \$22 million closing summation request, the jury returned a verdict of \$759,800; a post-closing high-low agreement was agreed upon, eliminating appeal risk and resulting in \$1 million less than what was offered to the plaintiff pre-closings.