



Sara McLaughlin

Associate

sara.mclaughlin@wilsonelser.com

Orlando, FL – 407.203.7587

Sara McLaughlin handles a wide array of complex civil litigation for a diverse range of clients, including insurers, property owners, retail stores, and other large corporations. Her practice focuses on the defense of claims related to commercial litigation, general liability, premises liability, product liability, construction, and first-party property, as well as nursing home negligence and insurance coverage. Sara adeptly handles matters before state and federal courts.

Prior to joining Wilson Elser, Sara practiced at a firm specializing in health care law and defense, where she represented physicians and other providers in medical malpractice litigation and administrative proceedings.

Medical Malpractice

Sara's significant experience defending against high-exposure liability claims involving medical malpractice enhances her ability to develop effective defense strategies related to complex nursing home negligence litigation.

Commercial Litigation

Sara provides clients with innovative and timely strategic counsel to help them make better-informed decisions, resolve complex legal challenges, and achieve specific business goals. She draws on the firm's deep resources and national footprint to handle large, multijurisdictional, and complex cases that often rise to "bet the company" status.

Education

- Barry University, Dwayne O. Andreas School of Law (J.D., 2019)
 - cum laude

Services

- Insurance & Reinsurance Defense
- Commercial Litigation
- Product Liability, Prevention & Government Compliance

- University of Central Florida (B.S., 2016)

Bar Admissions

- Florida

Court Admissions

- U.S. District Court, Middle District of Florida
- U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida
- U.S. District Court, Northern District of Florida

Professional Affiliations

- Young Lawyers Divisions, Florida Bar

Client Wins

Young & McLaughlin Obtain Summary Judgment for Lack of Admissible Evidence

Julia Young (Partner-Orlando, FL) and Sara McLaughlin (Associate-Orlando, FL) secured a summary judgment for our insurance company client in a case pending in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida. The court entered an Order striking both of the plaintiff's experts, as the experts were neither timely nor properly disclosed, and then granted Julia and Sara's Motion for Summary Judgment on the basis that the plaintiff lacked any admissible evidence that her property damage arose from a covered cause of loss during the subject policy period. In view of the judgment in favor of our client, as well as a prior Offer of Judgment/Proposal for Settlement served upon the plaintiff by our client and rejected by the plaintiff, the judge entered his Order awarding to our client attorneys' fees in the amount of \$36,324.50 and costs in the amount of \$2,693.00. It is noted that, upon notice to the plaintiff's counsel that we would be moving to strike the plaintiff's experts and for summary judgment, the plaintiff moved the court for leave to voluntarily dismiss her Complaint, without prejudice to refile, and her request was denied by the court.

Young & McLaughlin Secure Dismissal on Grounds of Noncompliance

Julia Young (Partner-Orlando, FL) and Sara McLaughlin (Associate-Orlando, FL) secured dismissal of a case involving a dispute between a contractor, as assignee of the insured and our carrier client over payment for water mitigation services following a loss at the insured's property. Julia and Sara moved to dismiss with prejudice, arguing the contractor lacked standing because its assignment of benefits (AOB) was invalid under Florida Statute §627.7152. Specifically, it was argued that the AOB failed to include the statutorily required written, itemized, per-unit cost estimate, and instead attached only a generic price list, and that noncompliance rendered the AOB void, eliminating any right to sue. Sara and Julia further asserted that the breach of contract claim failed for lack of a contractual relationship, and the quantum meruit claim was barred because any benefit from mitigation flowed to the homeowner. Lastly, the declaratory judgment count improperly sought an advisory opinion since the policy language is clear and no present

controversy existed. The court agreed with Julia and Sara on all grounds and granted the motion to dismiss with prejudice.