



Kieran R. Lang

Associate

kieran.lang@wilsonelser.com

New York, NY – 212.915.5287

Kieran Lang represents primary and excess insurers and concentrates his practice on coverage counseling and drafting coverage opinions on complex insurance matters involving directors and officers of public and private companies. Additionally, he handles a broad range of cyber liability matters, including assisting primary and excess insurers as coverage and monitoring counsel on first-party and third-party claims under cyber liability policies. Kieran effectively evaluates coverage issues involving data breaches, ransomware events, business email compromises, and other network security incidents, and advises insurers on data privacy, security, and technology errors and omissions exposures.

Prior to joining Wilson Elser, Kieran's practice consisted of insurance coverage and insurance defense litigation. Kieran also has experience in securities class actions, shareholder derivative actions, and individual income tax law.

Education

- Hofstra University School of Law (J.D., 2020)
 - Articles Editor, Hofstra Law Review
- University of Delaware (B.A., 2013)

Bar Admissions

- New York

Court Admissions

- U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York

Services

- Contractual/Extra-Contractual Liability Litigation
- Cyber Liability
- Cybersecurity & Data Privacy
- Directors & Officers Liability
- Insurance & Reinsurance Coverage
- Insurance & Reinsurance Defense

- U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York

Client Wins

Boone, Mueller, and Lang Secure Complete Dismissal in Legal Malpractice Case

Richard W. Boone Jr. (Partner-New York, NY), Siobhán A. Mueller (Of Counsel-New York, NY), and Kieren R. Lang (Associate-New York, NY) secured a complete victory in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, obtaining dismissal of all claims against their client, a respected law firm. The court held that the client firm could not be held liable for malpractice because it never represented the plaintiff, and because a lawyer's past conduct cannot be imputed to a new firm joined after the alleged wrongdoing occurred. The plaintiff had named the client firm solely because his former attorneys later joined it – long after their representation had ended.

In support of the motion to dismiss, Rich, Siobhán, and Kieran argued that all claims against the client firm must fail because it had no involvement in the underlying dispute and, as such, the plaintiff never had an attorney-client relationship with the firm. The team further maintained that the plaintiff's claims were based on speculation, conclusory allegations, and impermissible second-guessing of the attorneys' legal strategies, and therefore did not rise to the level of actionable malpractice, fraud, or a violation of the Judiciary Act, as alleged. The court agreed with Wilson Elser's arguments, granting the motion to dismiss.