



Zachary Miller

Of Counsel

zachary.miller@wilsonelser.com

Baltimore, MD – 410.962.7025

Zachary Miller represents clients and insurers in the field of insurance defense and general litigation.

Zachary joined Wilson Elser after several years practicing in the Baltimore area focusing on products liability, medical malpractice, insurance defense, commercial litigation, premises liability, construction defects and personal injury. Upon graduation from law school, Zachary was a Judicial Law Clerk for the Honorable Melissa Phinn of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, and served as a Judicial Intern for the Honorable Clayton Greene Jr.

Complex Tort & General Casualty

Zachary has experience advising and representing clients in a range of areas, including risk analysis, claims and litigation. He also has defended hospitality companies against human trafficking claims in various federal courts, including cases that involve Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act claims against large hotel chains.

Medical Malpractice

Zachary's practice includes the defense of medical malpractice actions on behalf of individual health care providers, long-term care facilities and health care institutions.

Product Liability, Prevention & Government Compliance

Zachary has handled matters involving the defense of a medical device company.

Transportation

Zachary has experience handling a wide range of matters involving transportation claims, including those accidents involving passenger vehicles as well as tractor trailers and common carriers.

Services

- Complex Tort & General Casualty
- Medical Malpractice & Health Care
- Long-Term Care
- Transportation
- Construction
- Product Liability, Prevention & Government Compliance
- Professional Liability & Services

Education

- University of Maryland, Francis King Carey School of Law (J.D., 2016)
- Elizabethtown College (B.A., 2010)

Bar Admissions

- Maryland

Court Admissions

- Court of Appeals of Maryland
- U.S. District Court, District of Maryland

Professional Affiliations

- Maryland State Bar Association
- Bar Association of Baltimore City
- DRI: The Voice of the Defense Bar
- Maryland Defense Counsel, Inc., Executive Committee Officer – Treasurer, Judicial Selections Committee and Chair of the Programs Committee
- The Foundation for Baltimore County Public Library, Board Member

Awards & Honors

- Selected for inclusion in *The Best Lawyers in America® Ones to Watch™*, 2024-2026
- Selected for inclusion in *Super Lawyers®, Rising Stars™*, Maryland, 2022-2024

Representative Matters

Successfully argued a motion to dismiss in Delaware involving the representation of a charter school.

Successfully argued a motion for summary judgment in Maryland in defense of a swimming facility alleged to have failed to prevent a child from nearly drowning.

Publications

December 2020

Runaway Inflation: Adjusting for Social Inflation in Litigation

CLM Magazine

March 2020

Educate, Activate, Report: “Limiting Labor and Human-Trafficking Civil Liability for

Businesses”

DRI: For the Defense

Client Wins

Murphy-Petros, Smith & Miller Secure Appellate Win Based on Plaintiff’s Own Dilatory Conduct in Discovery

Melissa Murphy-Petros (Of Counsel-Chicago, IL), Brigitte Smith (Partner-Baltimore, MD), and Zachary Miller (Associate-Baltimore, MD) represented a provider of public transportation services in Baltimore City to those with physical disabilities. The legally blind plaintiff, a regular rider, filed suit after he suffered a severe fracture when he fell on ice while walking from his front door to our client’s bus. The plaintiff claimed that our driver was negligent in not assisting him while he walked to the bus as the driver was required to do, but admitted that he did not wait for the driver to help him on the day of his injury. The case was tried to a defense verdict by Brigitte and Zak and Melissa handled the appeal. The appellate court affirmed the judgment on the jury’s verdict. The only issue plaintiff raised on appeal was the trial court’s order denying his motion to strike a supplemental medical expert opinion that we disclosed approximately 10 days before trial. It was plaintiff’s position that this testimony at trial was the basis for the jury’s defense verdict and it should not have been allowed, so he was entitled to a new trial. In the end, the court agreed with our argument that plaintiff’s own dilatory conduct in discovery led to the late timing of our supplemental disclosure in the first place, so the trial judge did not abuse her discretion in denying plaintiff’s motion to strike.