



Daily Journal Recognizes MG+M Asbestos Trial Win Among Top Verdicts of 2024

February 21, 2024

The *Daily Journal* recognized MG+M The Law Firm in its annual list of [Top Verdicts](#) (subscription required) for obtaining a [complete defense verdict](#) in Los Angeles Superior Court on behalf of a former supplier of asbestos cement pipe. The annual *Daily Journal* series spotlights the largest and most significant verdicts and appellate reversals in California.

MG+M Partners [Adam Hays](#), [Carrie Lin](#) and [Kyle Stevens](#) led the team through different stages of the four-week trial, all serving as the first chair. The plaintiff's counsel asked for an award of more than \$100 million in addition to punitive damages for alleged years-long exposure to asbestos from our client's asbestos cement water pipe, which the plaintiff claimed caused him to contract lung cancer.

Based on evidence that our client's asbestos cement pipe bore warning labels against improper use, as well as expert and fact witness testimony regarding industry knowledge of asbestos hazards in the 1980s, MG+M argued that the plaintiff's exposure to asbestos could not be legally attributed to our client, as the plaintiff failed to work with the product in the manner recommended by the company and adhere to the applicable OSHA standards in place at the time. The jury came back with a complete defense verdict for our client within three hours.

The entire trial team contributed tremendous work and efforts in this case, including MG+M Manager of Technology Christopher Baughman, Lead Trial Paralegal Christopher McHale and Partner [Anna Hwang](#).

[Read](#) the Daily Journal's profile on this verdict (subscription required).

mgmlaw.com

Boston | Boston - State Street | Chicago | Dallas | Hattiesburg | Irvine | Jackson | Los Angeles | Madison County/St. Louis | Miami | New Jersey | New Orleans | New York | Providence | San Francisco | Walnut Creek | Wilmington

Attorney Advertising. This material is for general informational purposes only and does not represent our advice as to any particular set of facts; nor does it represent any undertaking to keep recipients advised of all legal developments. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. © 2025 Manning Gross + Massenburg LLP