

RELATED PRACTICES

Asbestos, Silica, and Manganese

Litigation

Toxic Torts

MITCHELL QUOTED IN *LAW360* STORY TITLED "CALIF. CASES OFFER CHANCE FOR CLARITY ON TAKE-HOME ASBESTOS"

October 28, 2014

Robert Mitchell, a partner in the Vorys Cincinnati office and a member of the litigation group, was quoted in a *Law360* story about a pair of cases under review by the California Supreme Court. The cases are related to whether companies should be held liable for asbestos-related injuries to people whose exposure to the substance was secondhand.

The story states:

"The question of whether premises owners and product makers face different liability for secondary exposure to family members of those who worked at their facilities or with their products — if they face liability at all — has been controversial, and attorneys say that the California Supreme Court's views could be especially influential, as the state's large size has always made it a jurisdiction that attorneys have looked to for guidance on tort cases, attorneys say.

'Everyone who practices in asbestos litigation actively has their attention focused on California,' said Robert Mitchell of Vorys Sater Seymour and Pease LLP. "Their appellate rulings tend to be influential throughout the country.'

*The California Supreme Court agreed in August to consider two lower court decisions that came to different conclusions about whether a business owes a duty to those it did not have a direct relationship with. One of the cases, *Kesner v. Superior Court*, involved a suit against a product maker, and the other case, *Haver v. BNSF Railway Co.*, involved a premises owner."*

To read the entire story, visit the *Law360* website. (Subscription may be required).