



## Jennafer G. Groswith

Partner

[jennafer.groswith@wilsonelser.com](mailto:jennafer.groswith@wilsonelser.com)

Dallas, TX – 214.698.8074

Jennafer Groswith has gained broad and varied experience over the course of her more than 20-year career. She practices in many areas of civil litigation, including medical malpractice, construction defects, transportation, trucking accidents, catastrophic industrial accidents, nonsubscriber claims, toxic tort and product liability. Jennafer is well known in state and federal courts across Texas, and she handles arbitrations and appellate matters arising from her cases.

Jennafer is adept at formulating medical and legal defenses, leaving no stone unturned in her quest to get the best results while meeting her clients' needs. Performing an early and thorough investigation of every fact and legal nuance of the case, Jennafer can see the bigger picture and shape the case toward a favorable outcome for her clients, from reasonable, early resolution to a verdict secured through efficient and focused case management. Jennafer also develops themes early on in each case so that when it is time for trial, she has a succinct and favorable set of facts and evidence for the jury shaped in accordance with those themes. Jennafer excels at determining a realistic and attainable settlement or verdict amount, and knows how to challenge the credibility of a witness and effectively impeach an opposing expert's testimony.

### **Medical Malpractice**

Wilson Elser's Medical Malpractice team is recognized in the industry as among the top firms in the United States. Jennafer provides direct defense for professionals on individual cases in courts, before regulatory bodies, and in arbitrations and mediations. She represents physicians, hospitals and clinics of all sizes, providing all associated services, such as litigation, practice and risk management, regulatory, investigations and ethics, and transactional matters.

### **Catastrophic Trucking Accidents**

Trucking companies can no longer pay exorbitant settlements or judgments along with

### **Services**

- Health Care Law
- Construction
- Transportation
- Complex Tort & General Casualty
- Workers' Compensation

rising tolls, skyrocketing fuel costs, and increases in fines and fees. Jennafer defends her clients with a keen awareness of legislative, regulatory, technological and other developments that have an impact on the industry. She leverages Wilson Elser's nationwide 24/7 response program to help ensure that statements are taken and evidence is gathered during the first critical hours following a catastrophe.

### **Catastrophic Industrial Accidents**

Industrial accidents need a steady hand and a depth of knowledge from the moment the call comes in through trial. Jennafer has been handling industrial accidents for 15 years and knows how to best conduct the initial investigation, inspections and interviews to develop the strongest defenses for the client, and can quickly identify potential problems, assess solutions and select the experts needed to defend the case.

### **Nonsubscriber Cases**

Nonsubscriber claims for work-related injuries require a knowledgeable attorney to provide a successful defense. Jennafer's experience in this area makes her a formidable advocate for clients and an effective defender of their rights. Jennafer has extensive experience in all aspects of nonsubscriber law, from enforcing arbitration agreements to the initial investigation of an accident through mediation and arbitration, including handling appellate issues of arbitrability.

### **Construction Defects**

Jennafer represents architects, engineers, general contractors and subcontractors through all phases of construction litigation and counsel. She is continually aware of changes in case law, technological advances, the current claims environment, and the industry rules and ethical guidelines that impact architects and engineers.

### **Product Liability**

Wilson Elser's Product Liability, Prevention & Government Compliance Practice is among the largest and most diversified in the United States, frequently extending beyond legal defense to the business effects on risk management. Jennafer leverages the firm's cross-practice environment to defend clients against product liability and mass tort actions in a variety of categories, especially fires resulting from allegedly faulty products.

### **Education**

- Southern Methodist University Dedman School of Law (J.D., 2001)
- Stanford University (M.A., 1998)
- Stanford University (B.A., 1997)

### **Bar Admissions**

- Texas

### **Court Admissions**

- U.S. District Court, Northern District of Texas

- U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Texas
- U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas

### **Professional Affiliations**

- Dallas Bar Association
- Dallas Association of Young Lawyers
- William “Mac” Taylor Inn of Court

### **Awards & Honors**

- Selected for inclusion in *The Best Lawyers in America®*, 2025-2026
- Selected for inclusion in *The Best Lawyers in America® Women in Law*, 2025

## **Client Wins**

### **Manfredi and Groswith Deliver Summary Judgment Victory in SPF Product Liability and Toxic Tort Litigation**

Michael Manfredi (Partner-Atlanta, GA) and Jennafer Groswith (Partner-Dallas, TX) secured summary judgment for SWD Urethane, an Arizona-based spray polyurethane foam manufacturer, in the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Georgia. The plaintiff alleged that SWD manufactured defective and toxic spray polyurethane foam (SPF) insulation applied in her home during a November 2020 renovation. Upon returning, she claimed to experience a range of symptoms –including headaches, breathing difficulties, chest tightness, and rashes – which she attributed to SPF exposure. The plaintiff brought claims against SWD for strict product liability (design defect), negligent product liability (design defect), failure to warn, negligence per se, punitive damages, and attorneys' fees.

Mickey and Jennafer moved for summary judgment on multiple grounds, including the plaintiff's failure to respond to SWD's requests for admissions, which were deemed admitted, and the absence of competent evidence connecting SWD to the SPF installed in the plaintiff's home. In opposing the motion, the plaintiff relied on unverified air quality expert reports and a late-disclosed medical causation affidavit from her treating physician to establish the causal link between the SPF and her injuries. Wilson Elser successfully moved to strike or exclude these submissions, arguing that the air quality reports were unsworn and, therefore, did not satisfy the evidentiary requirements for consideration on summary judgment, and that the treating physician's causation testimony constituted undisclosed expert opinion offered after the close of discovery. The court agreed and excluded all three expert reports.

With the expert evidence excluded, the plaintiff was left with only a single invoice between SWD and the co-defendant installer as purported proof that SWD manufactured the SPF at issue. Mickey and Jennafer argued that the invoice was insufficient to create a genuine dispute of material fact, as it did not establish that the products listed were SPF, that they were used in the plaintiff's home, or that SWD was the manufacturer rather than merely a seller. The court agreed that no reasonable jury could conclude from the invoice alone that

SWD manufactured the SPF applied in the plaintiff's home, granted summary judgment on all claims and dismissed SWD from the case with prejudice, and awarded its costs.

**Growth and Cord Secure Summary Judgement Win**

Jennafer Growth (Partner-Dallas) and Stephen Cord (Associate-Dallas) secured a summary judgment win for their roofing client in a multiparty commercial construction defect case. The Plaintiffs alleged that their surgery center and medical buildings were unusable as a result of a myriad of construction defects which included the TPO membrane roof. Plaintiffs claimed the roof on both buildings needed to be replaced and the General Contractor claimed over \$1M in damages was owed by their roofing client. They moved for summary judgment based on the complete lack of evidence that their client violated the standard of care or that the roof was causing any damage. At the last minute, opposing counsel filed a motion to continue the hearing to try to buy more time to drum up evidence. The Court correctly denied opposing counsel's motion to continue and granted their No Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment.