



## Dmitriy Golosinskiy

Partner

[dmitriy.golosinskiy@wilsonelser.com](mailto:dmitriy.golosinskiy@wilsonelser.com)

Portland, OR – 971.352.3022

Dmitriy Golosinskiy maintains a products liability practice that includes toxic tort, asbestos exposure, talc exposure and general product liability claims. Dmitry also defends claims involving dram shop liquor liability, premises liability, and other tort claims involving personal injuries and wrongful death.

Dmitriy handles a range of claims from pre-litigation, active lawsuits (including class actions) and appeals to matters in state and federal appellate courts. His experience enables him to represent a wide array of clients, from large multinational corporations to small family businesses and individuals. He represents clients in the role of both local and national counsel.

Dmitriy previously externed for the Honorable Dennis J. Graves at the Marion County Circuit Court and the Honorable Robert E. Jones at the United States District Court for the District of Oregon. Both experiences offered Dmitry a first-hand look into the importance of professionalism, zealous advocacy, thorough legal research and stellar legal writing skills. As an attorney, he works to ensure those skills are exemplified in his practice.

### **Product Liability, Prevention & Government Compliance**

Dmitriy has defended numerous product liability cases involving heavy-duty trucks and related components, passenger vehicles and consumer products.

### **Toxic Tort**

Dmitriy represents manufacturers, suppliers and contractors in cases alleging exposure to asbestos and benzene.

### **Complex Tort & General Casualty**

Dmitriy's Complex Tort & General Casualty practice includes defense of landlords in class action litigation. He also represents employers, companies and individuals in cases

### **Services**

- Product Liability, Prevention & Government Compliance
- Toxic Tort
- Complex Tort & General Casualty
- Asbestos & Talc
- Engineered Stone
- Transportation

involving severe workplace injuries, motor vehicle collisions, premises liability and dram shop claims.

## Education

- Lewis & Clark Law School (J.D., *cum laude*, 2017)
  - Symposium Editor, Board Member, Environmental Law, 2016–2017
  - Ninth Circuit Law Review, Member, Environmental Law, 2015–2016
  - Jewish Legal Society
  - Business Law Society
- Washington State University (B.A. Public Affairs, *magna cum laude*, 2014)

## Bar Admissions

- Oregon
- Washington

## Court Admissions

- U.S. District Court, District of Oregon

## Professional Affiliations

- Oregon Association of Defense Counsel
- Campaign for Equal Justice, Associates Committee Member, 2018–2023
- Lewis & Clark Law Mentorship Program, Mentor, 2018–2022
- Lewis & Clark Law Alumni Board of Directors, 2019
- Lewis & Clark Law Recent Graduate Council, 2017–2019

## Awards & Honors

Selected for inclusion in *Super Lawyers*®, Rising Stars™ in the area of Civil Litigation: Defense, 2024

## Languages

- Russian
- Ukrainian

# Client Wins

**Pitcher and Golosinskiy Obtain Spoliation Dismissal on Behalf of Truck Manufacturer in Oregon Federal Court**

Portland, Oregon, partners George S. Pitcher and Dmitriy S. Golosinskiy prevailed on a motion to dismiss on behalf of a major U.S. truck manufacturer due to plaintiffs' spoliation of evidence. The plaintiffs, operating a client-manufactured truck owned by their employer, were hospitalized after rear-ending a stopped tractor-trailer. After the collision, they emailed their employer, stating they had retained a lawyer, demanding preservation of the vehicle, and threatening to seek spoliation sanctions if it was lost or destroyed. The plaintiffs' experts inspected the vehicle and identified components to be preserved. The employer sold the truck, which our client did not have an opportunity to inspect. The court found "culpability" on behalf of plaintiffs for their failure to notify our client and provide it with an opportunity to inspect the truck. The court acknowledged that a duty to preserve evidence applied even though the truck was not "directly" within plaintiff's custody or control. After considering all the factors, including less drastic sanctions, the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon agreed with George and Dmitriy that dismissal was warranted, given the prejudice to our client and its inability to inspect the truck that plaintiffs claimed was defective.