

Amicus

We are fiercely driven to support industry through amicus briefing in state and federal courts across the country.

As litigators and appellate counsel in individual, mass tort, class action, and serial litigation, Hollingsworth LLP understands that our clients' success in the courtroom is heavily dependent upon legal doctrines developed in other litigation. Accordingly, with the plaintiffs' bar actively pursuing opportunities to weaken traditional principles of duty, causation, and harm as requisite foundations for legal liability, we have leveraged our clients' interests through an active amicus practice in dozens of cases before the United States Supreme Court, federal courts of appeals, and state supreme courts across the country.

THE VOICE OF INDUSTRY

Hollingsworth LLP has become the amicus voice of industry on a broad array of legal issues impacting our clients, such as the proper standards for expert testimony admissibility, federal preemption, regulatory overreach, the government contractor defense, standing, and no-causation plaintiff theories of public nuisance, low dose or every fiber exposure, and risk contribution. Because of our insider's knowledge of various industries, we are regularly retained by the most prominent industry groups in the country, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, PhRMA, American Chemistry Council, American Coatings Association, American Petroleum Institute, American Federation of Petrochemical Manufacturers, American Tort Reform Association, National Bankers Association, Associated General Contractors of America, and International Association of Defense Counsel, among others.

BRIEFS THAT MAKE A DIFFERENCE

Our amicus briefs focus on issues not raised in the merits briefs and highlight the larger implications of erroneous rulings in individual cases to the proper administration of fair justice in the courts. Our amicus briefs have contributed to major victories for industry, such as in *Sherwin-Williams Co. v. Gaines*, 75 So.3d 41 (Miss. 2011), in which the Mississippi Supreme Court expressly cited to our amici arguments in instructing Mississippi trial courts to more faithfully serve as gatekeepers against unreliable expert testimony:

Amici urge that we instruct trial courts to make particularized findings as to the admissibility of expert opinions.... Our trial judges work exceedingly hard and have discretion in how they discharge their gatekeeping responsibility, but we take this opportunity to reiterate that such duty includes making sure the opinions themselves are based on sufficient facts or data and are the product of reliable principles and methods.

Id. at 46.

