

Las Vegas PI, Dental Malpractice and Medical Malpractice Attorney Placed at Plaintiff-side Car Defect Litigation Firm in the OC

It is interesting how much the market has changed since the pandemic descended upon the United States in March. Whereas before March, general corporate, real estate transactional, tech transactions and other transactions-based practice areas were very hot, these practice areas are now very slow (with the exception of tech transactions, which continues to be at least somewhat active, especially if the candidate has both tech transactions and data privacy experience. Data privacy continues to be very active).

Labor & employment was also very, very hot before March, and while we are still seeing some movement in this practice area, it is nothing like the movement that we were seeing before March. Currently, bankruptcy, tax, trusts & estates, patent prosecution to some extent and other niche practice areas are doing very well. Whereas bankruptcy was very slow before March, it is now booming. Interestingly, while litigation was active before the pandemic, it appears to be very active now. This is despite the fact that trials have been postponed and certain courts are still closed, in some cases until next year. However, firms are quickly adapting to this new work environment and world, and in the realm of litigation, firms are using Zoom for mediations, arbitrations, client calls and other conferences. They say that 90% of cases settle before going to trial, and if this really is the case, it doesn't surprise me that litigation continues to be active. Litigation involves a lot of legal research, writing and other pre-litigation work, that would not require courts to be open.

In regard to the candidate that I just placed, he is rather a unique candidate, and is different than the sorts of candidates that I typically work with. He graduated from a low-ranked law school, although he was in the Top 30% of his class there, obtaining his J.D. in 2005. For his undergraduate studies, he attended a low-ranked state university in California, graduating with a B.A. in 1994. In other words, his academics were average to below average, and he is quite a senior candidate. He started his career at a local litigation firm in Las Vegas, and then lateraled to a national insurance defense firm with a decent reputation. He was at the insurance defense firm very briefly before lateraling to a local firm in Sacramento. The candidate ended up staying at this Sacramento firm for about twelve years, splitting his time between Sacramento, Las Vegas and Incline Village, NV, and so obtaining state court experience in both California and Nevada. He ended up becoming an Equity Partner and the Managing Partner of the firm's Las Vegas office, an impressive feat, and his practice centered around dental malpractice, medical malpractice, construction defect, automobile accidents and other personal injury matters in California and Nevada. At this firm, he obtained extensive second chair trial experience (15+ trials) and even first chair trial experience on two cases. His first and second chair trial experience is what convinced me to work with this candidate.

Believe it or not, it is surprisingly difficult for firms to find candidates that have any trial experience, let alone first chair experience. I did get the feedback from a couple of firms that he didn't have enough trial experience, so for certain firms, especially plaintiff-side shops, they may expect to see even more than two trials as first chair, but in the end, his trial experience was enough to get him a solid job. Interestingly enough, this candidate lateraled to another firm in Las Vegas just eight months ago, and is now on the plaintiff-side, whereas the majority of his career and experience have been on the defense-side. I was a little concerned about how potential employers would view the mixed plaintiff and defense-side experience, and was concerned that conflicts might be an issue, but fortunately this was not an issue. I was also concerned that firms would be wary to hire someone who had just switched firms eight months ago.

I submitted this candidate to only about 15 firms, in LA, the OC and San Diego. He wanted to relocate from Las Vegas to Southern California in order to be closer to his children. He obtained only one interview through me, at a plaintiff-side boutique in the OC that specializes in car defect litigation, on huge, multi-million dollar cases against major car manufacturers (I think that the firm's specialty is defective airbags). He

was also interviewing at an elder abuse litigation firm in the OC, and a personal injury firm in LA that he had applied to on his own.

My firm conducted an initial Zoom interview with him, and then had him come into the OC office to meet with the managing partner and the Director of Operations. The managing partner of the firm really liked him, but told me that he would need training before the MP could throw him in as first chair on the firm's major cases. However, the candidate had enough second chair experience that the managing partner felt like he was worth the investment.

My firm ended up offering him a base of \$150K, and the elder abuse litigation firm offered him \$200K. My firm eventually went up to \$185K, because they wanted to extend a competitive offer, and because my candidate liked this firm, the managing partner and his cases so much, he decided to accept, even at the lower base. My candidate is very excited to make the transition from medmal and dental mal to automobile defect litigation, is very excited at the prospect of going up against major car manufacturers in court and is excited to train under the managing partner of my firm. I think that this opportunity will be an amazing learning and growth opportunity for my candidate, as well as a chance to relocate to sunny Southern California and be closer to his children. I couldn't be happier for this candidate, and I know that he will excel at his new firm home!