



Michael S. Rothrock

Partner

michael.rothrock@wilsonelser.com

Raleigh, NC – 984.268.2109

Mike Rothrock is an experienced trial attorney with a proven track record of trying complicated cases to verdict. His practice focuses on representing insurers and businesses in matters related to general liability, automobile and trucking liability, premises liability, animal liability and insurance coverage disputes. Mike has experience as both a plaintiff's lawyer and a defense lawyer.

Insurance Defense

In the area of insurance defense, Mike has successfully handled a wide variety of cases from the pre-suit investigation stages through appeal, including those involving wrongful deaths and catastrophic injuries.

Education

- Campbell University Norman Adrian Wiggins School of Law (J.D., 2008)
- University of North Carolina at Wilmington (B.A., 2005)
 - cum laude

Bar Admissions

- North Carolina

Court Admissions

- 10th Judicial District Bar
- U.S. District Court, Eastern District of North Carolina
- U.S. District Court, Middle District of North Carolina

Services

- Insurance & Reinsurance Defense
- Insurance & Reinsurance Coverage

Professional Affiliations

- North Carolina Bar Association
- North Carolina Association of Defense Attorneys
- Wake County Bar Association
- DRI: The Voice of the Defense Bar

Awards & Honors

- AV® Preeminent™ rated by Martindale-Hubbell
- Super Lawyers® Rising Star™ in Civil Litigation: Defense, 2018–2023
- The Gerry Spence Trial Lawyers College Graduate

Client Wins

Rothrock and Clements Obtain Summary Judgment Thwarting Product Liability Claim

Michael S. Rothrock (Of Counsel-Raleigh, NC) and Peter Clements (Associate-Charlotte, NC) obtained summary judgment in North Carolina Superior Court for a national distributor of smoking and vaping products and accessories. In this product liability case, the plaintiff sought damages for injuries sustained after a lithium-ion battery experienced a thermal runaway in his pocket, causing second-degree burns and scarring. The plaintiff contends that the distributor and retailer of the batteries are liable because they knew or should have known that the batteries were inappropriate for use in vaping devices and alleges that he was not warned of the dangers associated with them. There was a factual dispute between the parties as to whether the plaintiff was warned, but the plaintiff maintained that if he was warned, the warning was insufficient. Mike and Peter argued that the plaintiff's claims lack merit because the plaintiff failed to prove that our client distributed the battery; no evidence was presented establishing the claimed injury was caused by an act or omission of the client; any failure to warn was not a proximate cause of the injury; and the sealed container defense bars the plaintiff's claims. The court concurred, granting Mike and Peter's motion for summary judgment just before trial and dismissing the case.