From: **Paul Dulberg** pdulberg@comcast.net
Subject: Fwd: Middle of Gooch communications
Date: November 17, 2018 at 12:10 PM
To: juliawilliams@clintonlaw.net
Cc: ed@clintonlaw.net

PD

Dulberg v_ Popvic...ast.eml

Re/ Dulberg v_ Popovich.eml

Dulberg v_ The Law Of...ich.eml

Re/ Dulberg v_ The La...ich.eml

Re/ Dulberg v_ The La...ich.eml

Re/ Dulberg v_ The La...ich.eml

From: **Nikki** nikki@goochfirm.com
Subject: Dulberg v. Popvich and Mast
Date: June 7, 2018 at 1:35 PM
To: pdulberg@comcast.net
Cc: Sabina Walczyk swalczyk@goochfirm.com, Office Office office@goochfirm.com

Paul.

I have included Notice of Filing and First Amended Complaint to this email.

Thank you,

Nikki Justiniani
Office Assistant

The Gooch Firm
209 S. Main Street
Wauconda, IL 60084
P: 847-526-0110
F: 847-526-0603
E: nikki@goochfirm.com

First Amended Compl...aw.pdf

Notice (6.7.18) of Filing.pdf

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
McHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PAUL DULBERG,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 17 LA 377
	)	
THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., and HANS MAST,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AT LAW
(Legal Malpractice)

COMES NOW your Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG (hereinafter also referred to as "DULBERG"), by and through his attorneys, THE GOOCH FIRM, and as and for his First Amended Complaint against THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C. (hereinafter also referred to as "POPOVICH"), and HANS MAST (hereinafter also referred to as "MAST"), states the following:

1. Your Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, is a resident of McHenry County, Illinois, and was such a resident at all times complained of herein.

2. Your Defendant, THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., is a law firm operating in McHenry County, Illinois, and transacting business on a regular and daily basis in McHenry County, Illinois.

3. Your Defendant, HANS MAST, is either an agent, employee, or partner of THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C. MAST is a licensed attorney in the State of Illinois, and was so licensed at all times relevant to this Complaint.

4. That due to the actions and status of MAST in relation to POPOVICH, the actions and inactions of MAST are directly attributable to his employer, partnership, or principal, being THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPVICH, P.C.

5. Venue is therefore claimed proper in McHenry County, Illinois, as the Defendants transact substantial and regular business in and about McHenry County in the practice of law, where their office is located.

6. On or about June 28, 2011, your Plaintiff, DULBERG was involved in a horrendous accident, having been asked by his neighbors Caroline McGuire and William McGuire, in assisting a David Gagnon in the cutting down of a tree on the McGuire property. DULBERG lived in the same area.

7. At this time, Gagnon lost control of the chainsaw he was using causing it to strike and cut DULBERG's arm. This caused substantial and catastrophic injuries to DULBERG, including but not limited to great pain and suffering, current as well as future medical expenses, in an amount in excess of $260,000.00, along with lost wages in excess of $250,000.00, and various other damages.

8. In May of 2012, DULBERG retained THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., pursuant to a written retainer agreement attached hereto as **Exhibit A.**

9. A copy of the Complaint filed by MAST on his own behalf, and on behalf of DULBERG, is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**, and the allegations of that Complaint are fully incorporated into this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

10. An implied term of the retainer agreement attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, was that at all times, the Defendants would exercise their duty of due care towards their client and conform their acts and actions within the standard of care every attorney owes his client.

11. That as **Exhibit B** reveals, Defendants properly filed suit against not only the operator of the chain saw, but also his principals, Caroline McGuire and William McGuire, who purportedly were supervising him in his work on the premises.

12. At the time of filing of the aforesaid Complaint, MAST certified pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 137, that he had made a diligent investigation of the facts and circumstances around the Complaint he filed, and further had ascertained the appropriate law. MAST evidently believed a very good and valid cause of action existed against Caroline McGuire and William McGuire.

13. Also MAST incorrectly informed DULBERG that the insurance policy limit for the Gagnon was only $100,000.00, when in reality the policy was $300,000.00.

14. The matter proceeded through the normal stages of litigation until sometime in late 2013 or early 2014, when MAST began urging DULBERG to settle the matter against William McGuire and Caroline McGuire for $5,000.00.

15. On November 18, 2013, MAST wrote two emails to DULBERG urging DULBERG to accept the $5,000.00, "the McGuire's atty has offered us (you) $5,000 in full settlement of the claim against the McGuires only. As we discussed, they have no liability in the case for what Dave did as property owners. So they will likely get out of the case on a motion at some point, so my suggestion is to take the $5,000 now. You probably won't see any of it due to liens etc. but it will offset the costs deducted from any eventual recovery...." * * * "So if we do not accept their 5000 they will simply file a motion and get out of the case for free. That's the only other option is letting them file motion getting out of the case". (See Emails attached as **Group Exhibit C.**)

16. Similarly, on November 20, 2013 MAST emailed DULBERG urging him to accept the $5,000.00 otherwise "the McGuires will get out for FREE on a motion." (See Emails attached as **Group Exhibit C.)**

17. On or around December 2013 or January 2014, MAST met with DULBERG and other family members and again advised them there was no cause of action against William McGuire and Caroline McGuire, and verbally told DULBERG that he had no choice but to execute a release in favor of the McGuires for the sum of $5,000.00 and if he did not, he would get nothing.

18. DULBERG, having no choice in the matter, reluctantly agreed with MAST to accept the sum of $5,000.00 releasing not only William and Caroline McGuire, but also Auto-Owners Insurance Company from any further responsibility or liability in the matter. A copy of the aforesaid general release and settlement agreement is attached hereto as **Exhibit D.**

19. Continuously throughout the period of representation, MAST and POPOVICH represented repeatedly to DULBERG there was no possibility of any liability against William and/or Caroline McGuire and/or Auto-Owners Insurance Company, and lulled DULBERG into believing that the matter was being properly handled

20. After accepting the $5,000 settlement, DULBERG wrote MAST an email on January 29, 2014 stating "I trust your judgment." (See Email attached as **Exhibit E.)**

21. MAST and POPOVICH continued to represent DULBERG into 2015 and continuously assured him that his case was being handled properly.

22. On February 22, 2015, as to any chance of settling the remainder of his case against Gagnon MAST wrote to DULBERG that, "There's only $100,000 in coverage. Allstate will never offer anything near the policy limits therefore there's no chance to settle the case. The only

alternative is to take the case to trial and I am not interested in doing that." (See Email attached as **Exhibit F.**)

23. MAST and POPOVICH represented DULBERG through to and including March of 2015, following which DULBERG and the Defendants terminated their relationship due to a claimed failure of communication. MAST and POPOVICH withdrew from the representation of DULBERG.

24. Thereafter, DULBERG retained other attorneys and proceeded to a Court ordered binding mediation before a retired Circuit Judge, where DULBERG received a binding mediation award of $660,000.00 in gross, and a net award of $561,000.00. However, due to the settlement with the McGuires, DULBERG was only able to collect $300,000.00 based upon the insurance policy available. A copy of the aforesaid Mediation Award is attached hereto as **Exhibit G.**

25. The McGuires were property owners and had property insurance covering injuries or losses on their property, as well as substantial personal assets, including the property location where the accident took place at 1016 West Elder Avenue, in the City of McHenry, Illinois. McGuires were well able to pay all, or a portion of the binding mediation award had they still remained parties.

26. DULBERG, in his relationship with POPOVICH and MAST, cooperated in all ways with them, furnishing all necessary information as required, and frequently conferred with them.

27. Until the time of the mediation award, DULBERG had no reason to believe he could not recover the full amount of his injuries, based on POPOVICH'S and MAST'S representations to DULBERG that he could recover the full amount of his injuries from Gagnon, and that the inclusion of the McGuires would only complicate the case.

28. Following the execution of the mediation agreement and the final mediation award, DULBERG realized for the first time in December of 2016 that the information MAST and POPOVICH had given DULBERG was false and misleading, and that in fact, the dismissal of the McGuires was a serious and substantial mistake.

29. It was not until the mediation in December 2016, based on the expert's opinions that DULBERG retained for the mediation, that DULBERG became reasonably aware that MAST and POPOVICH did not properly represent him by pressuring and coercing him to accept a settlement for $5,000.00 on an "all or nothing" basis.

30. DULBERG was advised to seek an independent opinion from a legal malpractice attorney and received that opinion on or about December 16, 2016.

31. MAST and POPOVICH, jointly and severally, breached the duties owed DULBERG by violating the standard of care owed DULBERG in the following ways and respects:

a) Failed to take such actions as were necessary during their representation of DULBERG to fix liability against the property owners of the subject property (the McGuires) who employed Gagnon, and sought the assistance of DULBERG, for example hiring a liability expert;

b) Failed to thoroughly investigate liability issues against property owners of the subject property;

c) Failed to conduct necessary discovery, so as to fix the liability of the property owners to DULBERG, for example hiring a liability expert;

d.) Failed to investigate the insurance policy amounts of the McGuires and Gagnon;

e.) Incorrectly informed DULBERG that Gagnon's insurance policy was "only $100,000.00" and no insurance company would pay close to that;

f) Failed to understand the law pertaining to a property owner's rights, duties and responsibilities to someone invited onto their property by consulting an expert regarding these issues;

g) Improperly urged DULBERG to accept a nonsensical settlement from the property owners, and dismissed them from all further responsibility;

h) Failed to appreciate and understand further moneys could not be received as against Gagnon, and that the McGuires and their obvious liability were a very necessary party to the litigation;

i) Falsely advised DULBERG throughout the period of their representation, that the actions taken regarding the McGuires was proper in all ways and respects, and that DULBERG had no choice but to accept the settlement;

j) Coerced DULBERG, verbally and through emails. into accepting the settlement with the McGuires for $5,000.00 by misleading him into believing that had no other choice but to accept the settlement or else "the McGuires will get out for FREE on a motion".

k) Concealed from DULBERG the necessary facts for him to make an informed decision as to the McGuires, instead coercing him verbally and through emails into signing a release and settlement agreement and accept a paltry sum of $5,000.00 for what was a grievous injury;

l) Failed to properly explain to DULBERG all ramifications of accepting the McGuire settlement, and giving him the option of retaining alternative counsel to review the matter;

m) Continually reassured DULBERG that the course of action as to the property owners was proper and appropriate;

n) Failed to retain a liability expert to prove DULBERG's damages;

o) Were otherwise negligent in their representation of DULBERG.

32. That DULBERG suffered serious and substantial damages, not only as a result of the injury as set forth in the binding mediation award, but due to the direct actions of MAST and POPOVICH in urging DULBERG to release the McGuires, lost the sum of well over $300,000.00 which would not have occurred but for the acts of MAST and THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C.

WHEREFORE, your Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG prays this Honorable Court to enter judgment on such verdict as a jury of twelve (12) shall return, together with the costs of suit and such other and further relief as may be just, all in excess of the jurisdictional minimums of this Honorable Court.

Respectfully submitted by,

PAUL DULBERG, Plaintiff, by his attorneys THE GOOCH FIRM,



Thomas W. Gooch, III

PLAINTIFF HEREBY DEMANDS A TRIAL BY JURY OF TWELVE (12) PERSONS.



Thomas W. Gooch, III

Thomas W. Gooch, III
THE GOOCH FIRM
209 S. Main Street
Wauconda, IL 60084
847-526-0110
ARDC No.: 3123355
gooch@goochfirm.com
office@goochfirm.com

CONTRACT FOR LEGAL SERVICES

I agree to employ the LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C. (hereinafter "my attorney") to represent me in the prosecution or settlement of my claim against persons or entities responsible for causing me to suffer injuries and damages on the_____ day of _____, 20__.

My attorney agrees to make no charge for legal services unless a recovery is made in my claim. The approval of any settlement amount cannot be made without my knowledge and consent.

I agree to pay my attorney in consideration for his legal services a sum equal to one-third (33 1/3%) of my recovery from my claim by suit or settlement; this will increase to ~~40~~ % in the event my claim results in more than one (1) trial and/or an appeal of a trial. I understand my attorney may need to incur reasonable expenses in properly handling my claim including, but not limited to, expenses such as accident reports, filing fees, court reporters fees, video fees, records fees, and physician fees. I understand those expenses will be taken out of my settlement, in addition to my attorney's legal fee.

Client

Client

Date: _____

LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH

By: _____

Date: _____

LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C.
3416 West Elm Street
McHenry, Illinois 60050
815/344-3797

EXHIBIT
tabbies
A

COPY FILED
MAY 15 2012
KATHERINE M. KELLER
McHENRY CTY. CIR. CLK.

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
)SS
COUNTY OF McHENRY)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
McHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PAUL DULBERG,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DAVID GAGNON, Individually, and as Agent of CAROLINE MCGUIRE and BILL MCGUIRE, and CAROLINE MCGUIRE and BILL MCGUIRE, Individually,

Defendants.

No.: 12LA178

COMPLAINT

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, by his attorneys, LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., and complaining against the Defendants, DAVID GAGNON, Individually, and as Agent of CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, and CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, individually, and states as follows:

Count I

Paul Dulberg vs. David Gagnon, individually, and as Agent of Caroline and Bill McGuire

1. On June 28, 2011, the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, lived in the City of McHenry, County of McHenry, Illinois.

2. On June 28, 2011, Defendants CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE lived, controlled, managed and maintained a single family home located at 1016 W. Elder Avenue, in the City of McHenry, County of McHenry, Illinois.

NOTICE
BY LOCAL RULE 3.10
THIS CASE IS HEREBY SET FOR SCHEDULING CONFERENCE IN COURTROOM 204 ON 7-25 20 22, AT 2 AM PM
FAILURE TO APPEAR MAY RESULT IN THE CASE BEING DISMISSED OR AN ORDER OF DEFAULT BEING ENTERED.

NOTICE
BY LOCAL RULE 3.10
THIS CASE IS HEREBY SET FOR SCHEDULING CONFERENCE IN COURTROOM ON
20 AT AM PM
FAILURE TO APPEAR MAY RESULT IN THE CASE BEING DISMISSED OR AN ORDER OF DEFAULT BEING ENTERED.

EXHIBIT
tabbies
B

3. On June 28, 2011, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was living and/or staying at his parent's home at 1016 W. Elder Avenue, in the City of McHenry, County of McHenry, Illinois.

4. On June 28, 2011, the Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE contracted, hired the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, to cut down, trim and/or maintain the trees and brush at their premises at 1016 W. Elder Avenue, in the City of McHenry, County of McHenry, Illinois.

5. On June 28, 2011, and at the request and with the authority and permission of the Defendants CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, and for their benefit, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was working under their supervision and control while engaged in cutting, trimming and maintaining trees and brush at the premises at 1016 W. Elder Avenue, in the City of McHenry, County of McHenry, Illinois.

6. On June 28, 2011, as part of his work at the subject property, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was authorized, instructed, advised and permitted to use a chainsaw to assist him in his work for Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, which was owned by the McGuires.

7. On June 28, 2011, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was under the supervision and control of Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, and was working as their apparent and actual agent, and was then acting and working in the scope of his agency for Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE.

Received 11-28-2017 04:31 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 11-29-2017 09:53 AM / Transaction #17111117451 / Case #17LA000377

8. On June 28, 2011, and while the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was working in the course and scope of his agency for Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, and was under their supervision and control, Defendant, DAVID GAGNON was in use of a chainsaw while trimming a tree and branch.

9. On June 28, 2011, and while Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was in use of a chainsaw while trimming a tree and branch, Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, asked for and/or requested the assistance of the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, to hold the tree branch while Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, trimmed the branch with the chainsaw.

10. On June 28, 2011, and while Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was in sole control, use and operation of the subject chainsaw, the chainsaw was caused to strike and injure the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG.

11. At all relevant times, Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, knew of Defendant, DAVID GAGNON's use of the chainsaw in the presence of the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, and knew that such created a danger to the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG's safety.

12. That at all relevent times, the Defendants, DAVID GAGNON, as agent of CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, owed a duty to use care and caution in his operation of a known dangerous instrumentality.

13. On June 28, 2011, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was negligent in one or more of the following ways:

a. Failed to maintain control over the operating of the chainsaw;

b. Failed to take precaution not to allow the chainsaw to move toward the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, so as to cause injury;

c. Failed to warn the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, of the dangers existing from the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON's inability to control the chainsaw;

d. Failed to keep a proper distance from the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, while operating the chainsaw;

e. Otherwise was negligent in operation and control of the chainsaw.

14. That as a proximate result of the Defendant's negligence, the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, was injured externally; he has experienced and will in the future experience pain and suffering; he has been permanently scarred and/or disabled; and has become obligated for large sums of money for medical bills and will in the future become obligated for additional sums of money for medical care, and has lost time from work and/or from earning wages due to such injury.

15. That at the above time and date, the Defendant's negligence can be inferred from the circumstances of the occurrence as the instrument of the injury was under the control of the Defendant and therefore, negligence can be presumed under the doctrine of *Res Ipsa Loquitur*.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, demands judgment against Defendants, DAVID GAGNON, and CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE in an amount in excess of $50,000.00, plus costs of this action.

Count II

Paul Dulberg vs. Caroline McGuire and Bill McGuire

1 - 15. That the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, restates and realleges paragraphs 1 through 14, in Count I, above, as paragraphs 1 through 15 of Count II, as if fully alleged herein.

16. That at all relevant times, the Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, owned, controlled, maintained and supervised the premises whereat the accident to the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, occurred.

17. That at all relevant times, the Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, were in control of and had the right to advise, instruct and demand that the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, act or work in a safe and reasonable manner.

18. That at all relevant times, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was acting as the agent, actual and apparent, of Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, and was acting at their request and in their best interests and to their benefit as in a joint enterprise.

19. That at all relevant times, Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, knew DAVID GAGNON was operating a chainsaw with the assistance of the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, and had the right to discharge or terminate the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON's work for any reason.

20. That at all relevant times, Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, owed a duty to supervise and control Defendant, DAVID GAGNON's activities on the property so as not to create a unreasonable hazard to others, including the Plaintiff, PUAL DULBERG.

Received 11-28-2017 04:31 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 11-29-2017 09:53 AM / Transaction #17111117451 / Case #17LA000377

21. On June 28, 2011, the Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, were negligent in one or more of the following ways:

a. Failed to control operation of the chainsaw;

b. Failed to take precaution not to allow the chainsaw to move toward the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, so as to cause injury;

c. Failed to warn the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, of the dangers existing from the Defendant's inability to control the chainsaw;

d. Failed to keep the chainsaw a proper distance from the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, while operating the chainsaw;

e. Otherwise was negligent in operation and control of the chainsaw.

22. That as a proximate result of the Defendant's negligence, the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, was injured externally; he has experienced and will in the future experience pain and suffering; he has been permanently scarred and/or disabled; and has become obligated for large sums of money for medical bills and will in the future become obligated for additional sums of money for medical care, and has lost time from work and/or from earning wages due to such injury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, demands judgment against Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, in an amount in excess of $50,000.00, plus costs of this action.

LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C.

One of the Attorneys for Plaintiff

Hans A. Mast
LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C.
3416 West Elm Street
Lake, Illinois 60050
(815) 344-3797
ARDC No. 06203684

From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Subject: **Fwd: Dave's Best and oldest friend John**
Date: December 28, 2016 10:33:35 AM CST
To: paul_dulberg@comcast.net

From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Date: November 20, 2013 at 7:26:53 AM CST
To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
Subject: Re: Dave's Best and oldest friend John

Morning Hans,
Ok we can meet. I will call Sheila today and set up a time.
Please send me a link to the current Illinois statute citing that the property owner is not liable for work done on their property resulting in injury to a neighbor.
I need to read it myself and any links to recent case law in this area would be helpful as well.
Thanks,
Paul

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250
Sent from my iPad

> On Nov 20, 2013, at 6:59 AM, Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net> wrote:
>
> Paul, lets meet again to discuss. The legality of it all is that a property owner does not have legal liability for a worker (whether friend, son or otherwise) who does the work on his time, using his own independent skills. Here, I deposed the McGuires, and they had nothing to do with how Dave did the work other than to request the work to be done. They had no control on how Dave wielded the chain saw and cut you. its that simple. We don't have to accept the $5,000, but if we do not, the McGuires will get out for FREE on a motion. So that's the situation.
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
> To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
> Sent: Tue, 19 Nov 2013 02:29:56 -0000 (UTC)
> Subject: Re: Dave's Best and oldest friend John
> I still don't get how they don't feel responsible for work done on their property by their own son that ended up cutting through 40% of my arm.
> Perhaps their negligence is the fact that they didn't supervise the work close enough but they did oversee much of the days activity with David. Just because Dave was doing the work doesn't mean they were not trying to tell their kid what to do. They told him plenty of times throughout the day what to do. How is that not supervising?
> Paul
> Paul Dulberg
> 847-497-4250
> Sent from my iPad
>
> > On Nov 18, 2013, at 8:07 PM, Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net> wrote:
> >
> > Paul whether you like it or not they don't have a legal liability for your injury because they were not directing the work. So if we do not accept their 5000 they will simply file a motion and get out of the case for free. That's the only other option is letting them file motion getting out of the case
> >
> > Sent from my iPhone
> >
> > > On Nov 18, 2013, at 7:40 PM, Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > Only 5, That's not much at all.
> > > Is this a take it or leave it or do we have any other options?
> > >
> > > If you want a negligence case for the homeowners ask what happened immediately after the accident.
> > >
> > > Neither of them offered me any medical assistance nor did either of them call 911 and all Carol could think of besides calling David an idiot was calling her homeowners insurance.



They all left me out in the yard screaming for help while they were busy making sure they were covered.

She even went as far as to finally call the Emergency Room after I was already there just to tell me she was covered.

How selfish are people when they worry about if their insured over helping the person who was hurt and bleeding badly in their yard.

I'm glad she got her answer and had to share it with me only to find out her coverage won't even pay the medical bills.

I'm not happy with the offer.

As far as John Choyinski, he knows he has to call you and said he will tomorrow.

Paul

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250
Sent from my iPad

> On Nov 18, 2013, at 1:28 PM, Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net> wrote:
>
> Im waiting to hear from John. I tried calling him last week, but no one answered.
>
> In addition, the McGuire's atty has offered us (you) $5,000 in full settlement of the claim against the McGuires only. As we discussed, they have no liability in the case for what Dave did as property owners. So they will likely get out of the case on a motion at some point, so my suggestion is to take the $5,000 now. You probably won't see any of it due to liens etc. but it will offset the costs deducted from any eventual recovery....
>
> Let me know what you think..
>
> Hans
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
> To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
> Sent: Fri, 15 Nov 2013 22:41:26 -0000 (UTC)
> Subject: Dave's Best and oldest friend John
> Hans,
> Just spoke with John Choyinski again about talking with you.
> I am leaving your number with him as he has agreed to talk with you about David Gagnon.
> I believe he will try and call sometime tomorrow.
> Paul
> Oh and I know that nothing that happened right after the incident makes any difference as to the validity of the injuries but David's conduct immediately after the incident does show his lack of moral values for other humans and what he was willing and was not willing to do to help me get medical help. For his actions towards me or any other human being is enough to sue the shit out him alone. It is the things that happened afterwards that upset me the most.
> Sorry for the rant but Dave was a complete ass all the way and deserves this.
> Paul Dulberg
> 847-497-4250
> Sent from my iPad

The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich P.C.

3416 W. Elm Street
McHenry, Illinois 60050
Telephone: 815.344.3797
Facsimile: 815.344.5280
www.popovichlaw.com

Thomas J. Popovich
Hans A. Mast
John A. Kornak

Mark J. Vogg
James P. Tutaj
Robert J. Lumber
Theresa M. Freeman

January 24, 2014

Paul Dulberg
4606 Hayden Court
McHenry, IL 60051

RE: ***Paul Dulberg vs. David Gagnon, Caroline McGuire and Bill McGuire***
McHenry County Case: 12 LA 178

Dear Paul:

Please find enclosed the General Release and Settlement Agreement from defense counsel for Caroline and Bill McGuire. Please Release and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

COPY
HANS A. MAST

smq
Enclosure

EXHIBIT
tabbies
D

Waukegan Office
210 North Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue
Waukegan, IL 60085

GENERAL RELEASE AND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

NOW COMES PAUL DULBERG, and in consideration of the payment of Five-Thousand ($5,000.00) Dollars to him, by or on behalf of the WILLIAM MCGUIRE and CAROLYN MCGUIRE (aka Bill McGuire; improperly named as Caroline McGuire) and AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE COMPANY, the payment and receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, PAUL DULBERG does hereby release and discharge the WILLIAM MCGUIRE and CAROLYN MCGUIRE and AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE COMPANY, and any agents or employees of the WILLIAM MCGUIRE and CAROLYN MCGUIRE and AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE COMPANY, of and from any and all causes of action, claims and demands of whatsoever kind or nature including, but not limited to, any claim for personal injuries and property damage arising out of a certain chain saw incident that allegedly occurred on or about June 28, 2011, within and upon the premises known commonly as 1016 West Elder Avenue, City of McHenry, County of McHenry, State of Illinois.

IT IS FURTHER AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD that there is presently pending a cause of action in the Circuit Court of the 22nd Judicial Circuit, McHenry County, Illinois entitled "Paul Dulberg, Plaintiff, vs. David Gagnon, Individually, and as agent of Caroline McGuire and Bill McGuire, and Caroline McGuire and Bill McGuire, Individually, Defendants", Cause No. 2012 LA 178, and that this settlement is contingent upon WILLIAM McGUIRE and CAROLYN McGUIRE being dismissed with prejudice as parties to said lawsuit pursuant to a finding by the Circuit Court that the settlement between the parties constitutes a good faith settlement for purposes of the Illinois Joint Tortfeasor Contribution Act, 740 ILCS 100/0.01, *et seq.*

IT IS FURTHER AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD that as part of the consideration for this agreement the undersigned represents and warrants as follows (check applicable boxes):

- ☐ I was not 65 or older on the date of the occurrence.
- ☐ I was not receiving SSI or SSDI on the date of the occurrence.
- ☐ I am not eligible to receive SSI or SSDI.
- ☐ I am not currently receiving SSI or SSDI.

IT IS FURTHER AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD:

a. That any subrogated claims or liens for medical expenses paid by or on behalf of PAUL DULBERG shall be the responsibility PAUL DULBERG, including, but not limited to, any Medicare liens. Any and all reimbursements of medical expenses to subrogated parties, including Medicare's rights of reimbursement, if any, shall be PAUL DULBERG's responsibility, and not the responsibility of the parties released herein.

b. That any outstanding medical expenses are PAUL DULBERG's responsibility and all payment of medical expenses hereafter shall be PAUL DULBERG's responsibility, and not the responsibility of the parties released

c. That PAUL DULBERG agrees to save and hold harmless and indemnify the parties released herein against any claims made by any medical providers, including, but not limited to Medicare or parties subrogated to the rights to recover medical or Medicare payments.

IT IS FURTHER AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD by the parties hereto that this agreement contains the entire agreement between the parties with regard to materials set forth herein, and shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the parties hereto, jointly and severally, and the executors, conservators, administrators, guardians, personal representatives, heirs and successors of each.

IT IS FURTHER AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD that this settlement is a compromise of a doubtful and disputed claim and no liability is admitted as a consequence hereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal on the dates set forth below.

Dated: _____

_____
PAUL DULBERG

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF MCHENRY)

PAUL DULBERG personally appeared before me this date and acknowledged that she executed the foregoing Release and Settlement Agreement as his own free act and deed for the uses and purposes set forth therein.

Dated this _____ day of January, 2014.

_____
Notary Public

From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Subject: **Fwd: McGuire settlement**
Date: December 28, 2016 10:21:55 AM CST
To: paul_dulberg@comcast.net

From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Date: January 29, 2014 at 1:59:31 PM CST
To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
Subject: Re: McGuire settlement

Ok, it's signed and in the mail.
Hope that some yahoo in the govt. doesn't someday decide to go after everyone they think they might get a dollar out of and end up holding me responsible for the McGuires fees incurred while they fight it out.
I'm not in the business of warranting, insuring or protecting the McGuires from government. Especially for only 5 grand. For that kind of protection it could cost millions but I trust your judgement.
Paul

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250
Sent from my iPad

> On Jan 29, 2014, at 11:49 AM, Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net> wrote:
>
> SSD has to be part of it...its not going to effect anything...
> We can't prevent disclosure of the amount...
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
> To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
> Sent: Wed, 29 Jan 2014 17:47:39 -0000 (UTC)
> Subject: Re: McGuire settlement
> What and why do those questions have any relevance at all and why do they need to be part of this agreement?
> Particularly the one about being eligible.
> Also, I cannot warranty against what SSDI, Medicare or any other government institution wishes to do.
> Is it possible to make this agreement blind to the McGuires or David Gagnon?
> What I mean is can we make it so that the amount of money cannot be told to them in any way?
> It would drive David's ego crazy if he thought it was a large sum and was banned from seeing how much it is.
> Paul Dulberg
> 847-497-4250
> Sent from my iPad
>> On Jan 29, 2014, at 10:51 AM, Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net> wrote:
>>
>> Its not a big deal...if you weren't receiving it than don't check it...not sure what the question is...
>> ----- Original Message -----
>> From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
>> To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
>> Sent: Wed, 29 Jan 2014 16:16:04 -0000 (UTC)
>> Subject: McGuire settlement
>> Here is a copy of the first page.
>> It has check boxes and one of the check boxes says;
>> I am not eligible to receive SSI or SSDI.
>> Another says;
>> I am not receiving SSI or SSDI.
>> As you know, I have applied for SSDI and SSI



From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Subject: **Fwd: Memo**
Date: December 27, 2016 6:11:20 PM CST
To: paul_dulberg@comcast.net

From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Date: February 22, 2015 at 7:42:25 PM CST
To: Hans Mast <hansmast@att.net>
Subject: Re: Memo

To believe David's version of events you must believe I was committing suicide.
Who in their right mind puts his arm into a chainsaw?

I figured you would cop out again...

Now I'm left wondering...
How hard is it to sue an atty?

And yes I am and have been looking for someone who will take this case...

The issue of my word vs David Gagnons... Did he cut me or did I cut myself?

Of coarse he cut me.

Next issue please?

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250
Sent from my iPad

> On Feb 22, 2015, at 7:20 PM, Hans Mast <hansmast@att.net> wrote:
>
> Paul I no longer can represent you in the case. We obviously have differences of opinion as to the value of the case. I've been telling you over a year now the problems with the case and you just don't see them. You keep telling me how injured you are and completely ignore that it doesn't matter if you passed away from the accident because we still have to prove that the defendant was at fault. While you think it is very clear - it is not. My guess is that seven out of 10 times you will lose the case outright. That means zero. That's why I have been trying to convince you to agree to a settlement. You clearly do not want to. There's only $100,000 in coverage. Allstate will never offer anything near the policy limits therefore there's no chance to settle the case. The only alternative is to take the case to trial and I am not interested in doing that. I will wait for you to find a new attorney. I can't assist you any further in this case. Just let me know.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> > On Feb 22, 2015, at 7:14 PM, Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net> wrote:
> >
> > Let's not be harsh, We have a couple of weeks till dr Kujawa's billing arrives.
> > I agree showing me the memo is a good idea it's just not the accuracy I expected.
> > I know I'm being confrontative about all of this but let's face it, my working days are over let alone a career I have been building since I was in high school. My dreams of family are over unless I have enough to provide and pay for the care of children and a roof.
> > What's left for me?
> > Facebook, scrap booking, crafts, etc... A life of crap...
> > With ongoing pain and grip issues in my dominate arm/hand that are degenerative.
> >
> > This is as total as it gets for us in the working class short of being paralyzed or dead.
> >
> > I need someone who is on my side, top of their game and will see to it that I'm comfortable after all this is over.
> >
> > What I feel is an attempt to settle for far less than this is remotely worth just to get me off the books.



ADR systems

Binding Mediation Award

Paul Dulberg

v.

David Gagnon

ADR Systems File # 33391BMAG

On December 8, 2016, the matter was called for binding mediation before the Honorable James P. Etchingham, (Ret.), in Chicago, IL. According to the agreement entered into by the parties, if a voluntary settlement through negotiation could not be reached the mediator would render a settlement award which would be binding to the parties. Pursuant to that agreement the mediator finds as follows:

Finding in favor of: Paul Dulberg

Gross Award: $660,000.

Comparative fault: 15 % (if applicable)

Net Award: $561,000

Comments/Explanation

Medical	$ 60,000.
Future medical	$ 200,000.
Lost wage	$ 250,000.
P.I.S	75,000.
L.N.L	75,000.

The Honorable James P. Etchingham, (Ret.)

EXHIBIT 6

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TWENTY SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
McHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PAUL DULBERG, Plaintiff, v. THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C. and HANS MAST, Defendants.	)	No.: 17 LA 377

NOTICE OF FILING

TO: George Flynn (gflynn@clausen.com)
Clausen Miller, P.C.
10 South LaSalle Street, 16th Floor
Chicago IL 60603

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on **June 7, 2018** I caused to be filed with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of McHenry County, Illinois the attached *Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint at Law.*

Thomas W. Gooch, III

PROOF OF SERVICE

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedures, the undersigned certifies that she served a copy of the foregoing to whom it is addressed via the McHenry County I2File Efile System and via email transmission to on June 7, 2018.

THE GOOCH FIRM
209 South Main Street
Wauconda, Illinois 60084
847 526 0110
gooch@goochfirm.com
office@goochfirm.com
ARDC No.: 3123355

From: **Office Office** office@goochfirm.com
Subject: RE: Dulberg v. Popovich
Date: July 6, 2018 at 9:05 AM
To: me pdulberg@comcast.net
Cc: Sabina Walczyk swalczyk@goochfirm.com, Thomas W. Gooch III gooch@goochfirm.com

Hi Mr. Dulberg,

We have not received anything yet. As soon as we do, I will forward to you.

Thank you,

Melissa J. Podgorski
Paralegal
The Gooch Firm
209 South Main Street
Wauconda, Illinois 60084
(847) 526-0110 (phone)
(847) 526-0603 (fax)

-----Original Message-----
From: me <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 5, 2018 12:56 PM
To: Sabina Walczyk <swalczyk@goochfirm.com>; Thomas W. Gooch III <gooch@goochfirm.com>
Subject: Dulberg v. Popovich

Hi Sabina and Tom,

Have we receive the defendants response?

Hope you had a good 4th and Thank you both, Paul

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250

From: **Office Office** office@goochfirm.com
Subject: Dulberg v. The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich
Date: July 6, 2018 at 9:14 AM
To: me pdulberg@comcast.net
Cc: Thomas W. Gooch III gooch@goochfirm.com, Sabina Walczyk swalczyk@goochfirm.com, Nikki nikki@goochfirm.com

Dear Mr. Dulberg,

Sorry for the inconvenience, we did receive the attached Motion to Dismiss from the Defendant's yesterday. For some reason it was in my junk email.

Please note they set their motion for July 20, 2018. We will keep you advised of what transpires in Court that day. Also, please know that them filing a Motion to Dismiss is most common in response to a Complaint. The Judge will hear their motion and decide if he will allow it or not. If he does, we will have to file a response to their Motion to Dismiss. If the Judge denies their motion, we will have to amend the Complaint.

Basically, you have nothing to worry about at this time. This matter will not be dismissed based on that motion.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thank you,

Melissa J. Podgorski
Paralegal
The Gooch Firm
209 South Main Street
Wauconda, Illinois 60084
(847) 526-0110 (phone)
(847) 526-0603 (fax)

20180705154048263.pdf

27 9517 00 7

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
MCHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PAUL DULBERG,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 17LA000377
	)	
THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., and HANS MAST,	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

NOTICE OF MOTION

TO: Mr. Thomas W. Gooch, III
The Gooch Firm
209 S. Main Street
Wauconda, IL 60084
gooch@goochfirm.com

On **July 20, 2018 at 9:00 a.m.**, or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, we shall appear before the **Honorable Judge Thomas A. Meyer**, or any Judge sitting in his stead in **Courtroom 201,** in the **McHenry County Government Center, 2200 N. Seminary Avenue, Woodstock, Illinois** and present **Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Memorandum in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint at Law**, copies of which is attached and served upon you herewith.

/s/ George K. Flynn

GEORGE K. FLYNN
CLAUSEN MILLER P.C.

GEORGE K. FLYNN
CLAUSEN MILLER P.C.
ARDC No. 6239349
10 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603-1098
312-855-1010
Attorneys for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing document was caused to be served by Email on the 5th day of July, 2018, addressed to counsel of record as follows:

Mr. Thomas W. Gooch, III
The Gooch Firm
209 S. Main Street
Wauconda, IL 60084
gooch@goochfirm.com

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the undersigned certifies that the statements set forth in this Certificate of Service are true and correct.



IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
MCHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PAUL DULBERG,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 17LA000377
	)	
THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., and HANS MAST,	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS

Defendants, LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., and HANS MAST, by and through their attorneys, GEORGE K. FLYNN, and CLAUSEN MILLER P.C., pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/2-615, move to dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint at Law, and state as follows:

1. The Plaintiff Paul Dulberg ("Dulberg") retained defendants The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich P.C. ("Popovich") to prosecute a personal injury claim on his behalf against his next door neighbors, Carolyn and Bill McGuire and their adult son (Dulberg's lifelong friend), David Gagnon ("Gagnon")). Hans Mast ("Mast") handled the case for the firm. This legal malpractice case arises out of that underlying personal injury case.

2. It is clearly established that Illinois is a fact pleading jurisdiction, requiring the plaintiff to present a legally and factually sufficient complaint. *Winfrey v. Chicago Park Dist.*, 274 Ill. App. 3d 939, 942 (1st Dist. 1995). A plaintiff must allege facts sufficient to bring his or her claim within the cause of action asserted. *Jackson vs. South Holland Dodge,* 197 Ill. 2d 39 (2001).

3. In Illinois, to establish a legal malpractice claim, a plaintiff must plead and prove the existence of an attorney client relationship; a duty arising from that relationship; a breach of that duty, the proximate causal relationship between the breach of duty and the damage sustained; and actual damages. *Glass v. Pitler*, 276 Ill. App. 3d 344, 349 (1st Dist. 1995).

4. The plaintiff in a legal malpractice claim must plead a case within the case. *Ignarski v. Norbut*, 271 Ill. App. 3d 522 (1st Dist. 1995).

5. Dulberg fails to allege requisite facts in support of a legal malpractice claim, including each and every element of the "underlying" case or "case within the case" against the McGuires.

6. Dulberg's complaint must be dismissed pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/2-615.

WHEREFORE, Defendants, LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., and HANS MAST, pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/2-615, respectfully request this Honorable Court dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint at Law with prejudice, and for any further relief this Court deems fair and proper.

/s/ George K. Flynn

GEORGE K. FLYNN
CLAUSEN MILLER P.C.

GEORGE K. FLYNN
CLAUSEN MILLER P.C.
ARDC No. 6239349
10 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603-1098
(312) 855-1010
Attorneys for Defendants
gflynn@clausen.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing document was caused to be served by Email on the 5th day of July, 2018, addressed to counsel of record as follows:

Mr. Thomas W. Gooch, III
The Gooch Firm
209 S. Main Street
Wauconda, IL 60084
gooch@goochfirm.com

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the undersigned certifies that the statements set forth in this Certificate of Service are true and correct.



27 9517 00 7

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
MCHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PAUL DULBERG,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 17LA000377
	)	
THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., and HANS MAST,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AT LAW

Defendants, LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., and HANS MAST, by and through their attorneys, GEORGE K. FLYNN, and CLAUSEN MILLER P.C., pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/2-615, submit this Memorandum in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint at Law with prejudice, and state as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

The Plaintiff Paul Dulberg ("Dulberg") retained defendants The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich P.C. ("Popovich") to prosecute a personal injury claim on his behalf against his next door neighbors, Carolyn and Bill McGuire and their adult son (Dulberg's lifelong friend), David Gagnon ("Gagnon")). Hans Mast ("Mast") handled the case for the firm. Dulberg was on the McGuires' property, assisting Gagnon trim some tree branches with a chainsaw, when Dulberg's right arm was lacerated by the chainsaw. Dulberg agreed to a settlement with the McGuires. Thereafter, he and Mast reached an impasse. Mast and the firm withdrew, and successor counsel continued to prosecute the case against Gagnon.

Dulberg now has a case of "buyer's remorse," admitting that he reluctantly agreed to accept the McGuires' settlement offer. He has attempted to state a claim against Popovich and Mast for legal malpractice. However, he has not plead the requisite elements of a legal malpractice case against Popovich and Mast, or the requisite elements of the underlying case (the "case within the case").

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On November 28, 2017, Plaintiff filed his single count Complaint at Law for legal malpractice. Defendants moved to dismiss. On May 10, 2018, the Court granted Defendants' Motion to Dismiss pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/615 (see Order attached as Exhibit 1). During the hearing on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Judge Meyer ordered that the Plaintiff plead with more particularity and specificity regarding any allegations that he was misled. The Court also ordered the Plaintiff to provide more specificity and particularity with respect to any claims that information provided by Defendants to the Plaintiff was false and misleading. Plaintiff filed its First Amended Complaint at Law on June 7, 2018.

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. The Following Facts Can Be Gleaned From The First Amended Complaint (Exhibit 2) and Its Exhibits

On June 28, 2011, Dulberg was assisting David Gagnon in the cutting down of a tree on the property of Carolyn and Bill McGuire. (Exhibit 2, ¶ 6). Gagnon lost control of the chainsaw and caused personal injury to Dulberg. (Exhibit 2, ¶ 7). In May of 2012, Dulberg retained Popovich. (Exhibit 2, ¶8). On May 15, 2012, Mast filed a Complaint on behalf of Dulberg against Gagnon and the McGuires in the Circuit Court of McHenry County, Illinois, Case No, 12

LA 178. (Exhibit 2, ¶ 9, and Exhibit 2B)[1]. In late 2013, Dulberg settled with the McGuires and executed a Release in their favor in exchange for the payment of $5,000.00. The McGuires and their insurance carrier, Auto Owners Insurance Company, were released. (Exhibit 2, ¶ 18 and Exhibit 2D). Defendants continued to represent Dulberg until March 2015. (Exhibit 2, ¶ 21). Dulberg retained successor counsel and proceeded to a binding mediation and received a mediation award (Exhibit 2, ¶ 24 and Exhibit 2G). After the mediation, Dulberg allegedly realized for the first time that the information Mast and Popovich had given him was false and misleading and that the dismissal of the McGuires was a serious and substantial mistake. He was advised to seek an independent opinion from an attorney handling legal malpractice matters and received that opinion on or about December 16, 2016. (Exhibit 2, ¶ 28-29).

B. Alleged Acts of Negligence

Popovich's and Mast's alleged malpractice revolves around the settlement of the underlying case between Dulberg and McGuires. The allegations of a breach of the standard of care are all contained in ¶ 31, subsections a) through o) inclusive. Paragraph 31 states as follows:

> 31. MAST and POPOVICH, jointly and severally, breached the duties owed DULBERG by violating the standard of care owed DULBERG in the following ways and respects:
>
> a) Failed to take such actions as were necessary during their representation of DULBERG to fix liability against the property owners of the subject property (the McGuires) who employed Gagnon, and sought the assistance of DULBERG, for example hiring a liability expert;
>
> b) Failed to thoroughly investigate liability issues against property owners of the subject property;

[1] The exhibits to the underlying complaint in Case No. 12 LA 178 will be referenced as Exhibits 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 2E, 2F, and 2G.

c) Failed to conduct necessary discovery, so as to fix the liability of the property owners to DULBERG, for example hiring a liability expert;

d) Failed to investigate the insurance policy amounts of the McGuires and Gagnon;

e) Incorrectly informed DULBERG that Gagnon's insurance policy was "only $100,000.00" and no insurance company would pay close to that;

f) Failed to understand the law pertaining to a property owner's rights, duties and responsibilities to someone invited onto their property by consulting an expert regarding these issues;

g) Improperly urged DULBERG to accept a nonsensical settlement from the property owners, and dismissed them from all further responsibility;

h) Failed to appreciate and understand further moneys could not be received as against Gagnon, and that the McGuires and their obvious liability were a very necessary party to the litigation;

i) Falsely advised DULBERG throughout the period of their representation, that the actions taken regarding the McGuires was proper in all ways and respects, and that DULBERG had no choice but to accept the settlement;

j) Coerced DULBERG, verbally and through emails, into accepting the settlement with the McGuires for $5,000.00 by misleading him into believing that [sic] had no other choice but to accept the settlement or else "the McGuires will get out for FREE on a motion".

k) Concealed from DULBERG the necessary facts for him to make an informed decision as to the McGuires, instead coercing him verbally and through emails into signing a release and settlement agreement and accept a paltry sum of $5,000.00 for what was a grievous injury;

l) Failed to properly explain to DULBERG all ramifications of accepting the McGuire settlement, and giving him the option of retaining alternative counsel to review the matter;

m) Continually reassured DULBERG that the course of action as to the property owners was proper and appropriate;

n) Failed to retain a liability expert to prove DULBERG's damages;

o) Were otherwise negligent in their representation of DULBERG.

IV. DULBERG FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR LEGAL MALPRACTICE UNDER 735 ILCS 5/2-615

A. Legal Standard

It is clearly established that Illinois is a fact pleading jurisdiction, requiring the plaintiff to present a legally and factually sufficient complaint. *Winfrey v. Chicago Park Dist.*, 274 Ill. App. 3d 939, 942 (1st Dist. 1995). A plaintiff must allege facts sufficient to bring his or her claim within the cause of action asserted. *Jackson vs. South Holland Dodge,* 197 Ill. 2d 39 (2001). To pass muster a complaint must state a cause of action in two ways: first, it must be legally sufficient -- it must set forth a legally recognized claim as its avenue of recovery, and second, the complaint must be factually sufficient -- it must plead facts, which bring the claim within a legally recognized cause of action as alleged. *People ex rel. Fahner v. Carriage Way West, Inc.*, 88 Ill. 2d 300, 308 (1981). Dismissal of a complaint is mandatory if one fails to meet both requirements. *Misselhorn v. Doyle*, 257 Ill. App. 3d 983, 985 (5th Dist. 1994). In ruling on a Section 2-615 motion, "only those facts apparent from the face of the pleadings, matters of which the court can take judicial notice, and judicial admissions in the record may be considered." *Mount Zion State Bank and Trust v. Consolidated Communications, Inc.*, 169 Ill. 2d 110, 115 (1995).

In Illinois, to establish a legal malpractice claim, a plaintiff must plead and prove the existence of an attorney client relationship; a duty arising from that relationship; a breach of that duty, the proximate causal relationship between the breach of duty and the damage sustained; and actual damages. *Glass v. Pitler*, 276 Ill. App. 3d 344, 349 (1st Dist. 1995). The injuries

resulting from legal malpractice are not personal injuries but pecuniary injuries to intangible property interests. *Glass* at 349. Damages must be incurred and are not presumed. *Glass* at 349. It is the plaintiff's burden to establish that "but for" the attorney's negligence, the client would not have suffered the damages alleged. *Glass* at 349. "The proximate cause element of legal malpractice claim requires that the plaintiff show that but for the attorney's malpractice, the client would have been successful in the undertaking the attorney was retained to perform. *Green v. Papa*, 2014 IL App. (5th) 1330029 (2014), quoting *Owens v. McDermott Will & Emery*, 316 Ill. App. 340 (1st Dist. 2000), at 351. The plaintiff in a legal malpractice claim must plead a case within the case. *Ignarski v. Norbut*, 271 Ill. App. 3d 522 (1st Dist.1995).

B. Dulberg Fails to Plead Facts in Support of His Conclusory Allegations

Dulberg's second attempt at stating a claim fairs no better than his first. He still fails to plead with specificity and particularity as to how he was misled, or how any information provided to him was false and misleading. His allegations are pled in conclusory fashion throughout. He also fails to plead any facts concerning the McGuires' liability in the underlying case. His allegations concern the viability of a tort claim against property owners. Accordingly, he must plead facts in support of the property owners' [the McGuires] liability in the underlying case. Instead, Dulberg pleads only conclusions. More is necessary under Illinois law.

Dulberg has failed to follow the court's direction from the hearing on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss. The allegations of negligence contained in ¶ 31 fail to allege any facts in support of the conclusions. For example, what necessary discovery was not conducted? (¶ 31 (c)) What is the law pertaining to a property owner's duties and responsibilities? (¶ 31 (f)). How did defendants falsely advise Dulberg that the actions taken regarding the McGuires was proper? (¶ 31 (i)). What was concealed from Dulberg? (¶ 31 (k)). The bottom line is that Dulberg has yet to explain how the McGuires would have been found liable. The only thing that can be gleaned

from the facts alleged in the Complaint and First Amended Complaint, is that Dulberg was injured on their property. He fails to explain how the McGuire's breached any duty to him, and how they would have been liable.

Additionally, Dulberg's allegations of coercion are not supported by his own pleadings. It is reasonably inferred from the pleadings that Dulberg had ample time to retain another attorney (in fact later he did). Exhibit E to his First Amended Complaint establishes that he deliberated over the decision to settle, and mailed a signed release back to Mast. So how was he coerced, when he alleges that he met with Mast, and then later mailed the executed release?

Moreover, his allegations regarding the failure to retain an expert are unsupported. He also fails to explain why his successor counsel did not retain an expert at the appropriate time if necessary. Lastly, Dulberg can never properly allege proximately caused damages regarding the allegation in ¶ 31 (e), that Gagnon's insurance coverage was $300,000 and not $100,000. In fact, Dulberg admits in ¶ 24 that he recovered $300,000 in available coverage from Gagnon. If Mast incorrectly reported the available coverage, it did not cause any damage, as Dulberg's successor counsel was apparently able to recover the full amount of available coverage against the individual who injured Dulberg with a chainsaw.

Under Illinois fact pleading requirements, much more is needed. In a case of alleged professional liability, the plaintiff cannot simply allege in conclusory terms that the defendants were negligent, and that the Plaintiff could have proved up liability against the underlying defendants. He must allege why and how. Dulberg has failed twice. His First Amended Complaint must be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/2-615.

V. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Defendants, LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., and HANS MAST, pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/2-615 respectfully request this Honorable Court dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice, and for any further relief this Court deems fair and proper.

/s/ George K. Flynn

GEORGE K. FLYNN
CLAUSEN MILLER P.C.

GEORGE K. FLYNN
CLAUSEN MILLER P.C.
ARDC No. 6239349
10 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603-1098
(312) 855-1010
Attorneys for Defendants
gflynn@clausen.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing document was caused to be served by Email and/or U.S. Mail by depositing same in the U.S. Mail at 10 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, IL 60603, and properly addressed, with first class postage prepaid, on the 5th day of July, 2018, addressed to counsel of record as follows:

Mr. Thomas W. Gooch, III
The Gooch Firm
209 S. Main Street
Wauconda, IL 60084
gooch@goochfirm.com

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the undersigned certifies that the statements set forth in this Certificate of Service are true and correct.

EXHIBIT 1

Ln. 6

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 22ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF MCHENRY)

FILED
McHenry County, Illinois
MAY 10 2018
KATHERINE M. KEEFE
Clerk of the Circuit Court

GEN. NO. 17 LA 377
☐ Jury ☐ Non-Jury

Dulberg vs. Mast, et al

Date: 5-10-18 Plaintiff's Attorney S. Walczyk Defendant's Attorney G Flynn

ORDER

This matter before the Court on hearing on Defendants' combined Motion to Dismiss, both parties present by counsel, the Court fully advised in the premises

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Defendants' 2-615 motion to Dismiss is granted, and the 2-619 Motion is denied
2. Plaintiff granted 28 days (6/7/18) to file a First Amended Complaint
3. Defendants granted 28 days (7/5/18) thereafter to Answer or otherwise plead
4. Matter is set for status of pleadings on July 20, 2018 at 9:00 am in 201.

Prepared by: S. Walczyk/Leach Firm
Attorney for: Dulberg
Attorney Registration No.: 6315819

Judge:

EXHIBIT 2

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TWENTY SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
McHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PAUL DULBERG,
Plaintiff,

v.

THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C. and HANS MAST,
Defendants.

No.: 17 LA 377

NOTICE OF FILING

TO: George Flynn (gflynn@clausen.com)
Clausen Miller, P.C.
10 South LaSalle Street, 16th Floor
Chicago IL 60603

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on **June 7, 2018** I caused to be filed with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of McHenry County, Illinois the attached *Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint at Law.*

Thomas W. Gooch, III

PROOF OF SERVICE

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedures, the undersigned certifies that she served a copy of the foregoing to whom it is addressed via the McHenry County I2File Efile System and via email transmission to on June 7, 2018.

THE GOOCH FIRM
209 South Main Street
Wauconda, Illinois 60084
847 526 0110
gooch@goochfirm.com
office@goochfirm.com
ARDC No.: 3123355

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
McHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PAUL DULBERG, Plaintiff, v. THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., and HANS MAST, Defendant.	)	No. 17 LA 377

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AT LAW
(Legal Malpractice)

COMES NOW your Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG (hereinafter also referred to as "DULBERG"), by and through his attorneys, THE GOOCH FIRM, and as and for his First Amended Complaint against THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C. (hereinafter also referred to as "POPOVICH"), and HANS MAST (hereinafter also referred to as "MAST"), states the following:

1. Your Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, is a resident of McHenry County, Illinois, and was such a resident at all times complained of herein.

2. Your Defendant, THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., is a law firm operating in McHenry County, Illinois, and transacting business on a regular and daily basis in McHenry County, Illinois.

3. Your Defendant, HANS MAST, is either an agent, employee, or partner of THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C. MAST is a licensed attorney in the State of Illinois, and was so licensed at all times relevant to this Complaint.

4. That due to the actions and status of MAST in relation to POPOVICH, the actions and inactions of MAST are directly attributable to his employer, partnership, or principal, being THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPVICH, P.C.

5. Venue is therefore claimed proper in McHenry County, Illinois, as the Defendants transact substantial and regular business in and about McHenry County in the practice of law, where their office is located.

6. On or about June 28, 2011, your Plaintiff, DULBERG was involved in a horrendous accident, having been asked by his neighbors Caroline McGuire and William McGuire, in assisting a David Gagnon in the cutting down of a tree on the McGuire property. DULBERG lived in the same area.

7. At this time, Gagnon lost control of the chainsaw he was using causing it to strike and cut DULBERG's arm. This caused substantial and catastrophic injuries to DULBERG, including but not limited to great pain and suffering, current as well as future medical expenses, in an amount in excess of $260,000.00, along with lost wages in excess of $250,000.00, and various other damages.

8. In May of 2012, DULBERG retained THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., pursuant to a written retainer agreement attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

9. A copy of the Complaint filed by MAST on his own behalf, and on behalf of DULBERG, is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**, and the allegations of that Complaint are fully incorporated into this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

10. An implied term of the retainer agreement attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, was that at all times, the Defendants would exercise their duty of due care towards their client and conform their acts and actions within the standard of care every attorney owes his client.

11. That as **Exhibit B** reveals, Defendants properly filed suit against not only the operator of the chain saw, but also his principals, Caroline McGuire and William McGuire, who purportedly were supervising him in his work on the premises.

12. At the time of filing of the aforesaid Complaint, MAST certified pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 137, that he had made a diligent investigation of the facts and circumstances around the Complaint he filed, and further had ascertained the appropriate law. MAST evidently believed a very good and valid cause of action existed against Caroline McGuire and William McGuire.

13. Also MAST incorrectly informed DULBERG that the insurance policy limit for the Gagnon was only $100,000.00, when in reality the policy was $300,000.00.

14. The matter proceeded through the normal stages of litigation until sometime in late 2013 or early 2014, when MAST began urging DULBERG to settle the matter against William McGuire and Caroline McGuire for $5,000.00.

15. On November 18, 2013, MAST wrote two emails to DULBERG urging DULBERG to accept the $5,000.00, "the McGuire's atty has offered us (you) $5,000 in full settlement of the claim against the McGuires only. As we discussed, they have no liability in the case for what Dave did as property owners. So they will likely get out of the case on a motion at some point, so my suggestion is to take the $5,000 now. You probably won't see any of it due to liens etc. but it will offset the costs deducted from any eventual recovery...." * * * "So if we do not accept their 5000 they will simply file a motion and get out of the case for free. That's the only other option is letting them file motion getting out of the case". (See Emails attached as **Group Exhibit C.**)

Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377
Page 3 of 24

16. Similarly, on November 20, 2013 MAST emailed DULBERG urging him to accept the $5,000.00 otherwise "the McGuires will get out for FREE on a motion." (See Emails attached as **Group Exhibit C.)**

17. On or around December 2013 or January 2014, MAST met with DULBERG and other family members and again advised them there was no cause of action against William McGuire and Caroline McGuire, and verbally told DULBERG that he had no choice but to execute a release in favor of the McGuires for the sum of $5,000.00 and if he did not, he would get nothing.

18. DULBERG, having no choice in the matter, reluctantly agreed with MAST to accept the sum of $5,000.00 releasing not only William and Caroline McGuire, but also Auto-Owners Insurance Company from any further responsibility or liability in the matter. A copy of the aforesaid general release and settlement agreement is attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.

19. Continuously throughout the period of representation, MAST and POPOVICH represented repeatedly to DULBERG there was no possibility of any liability against William and/or Caroline McGuire and/or Auto-Owners Insurance Company, and lulled DULBERG into believing that the matter was being properly handled

20. After accepting the $5,000 settlement, DULBERG wrote MAST an email on January 29, 2014 stating "I trust your judgment." (See Email attached as **Exhibit E.**)

21. MAST and POPOVICH continued to represent DULBERG into 2015 and continuously assured him that his case was being handled properly.

22. On February 22, 2015, as to any chance of settling the remainder of his case against Gagnon MAST wrote to DULBERG that, "There's only $100,000 in coverage. Allstate will never offer anything near the policy limits therefore there's no chance to settle the case. The only

Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377

alternative is to take the case to trial and I am not interested in doing that." (See Email attached as **Exhibit F.)**

23. MAST and POPOVICH represented DULBERG through to and including March of 2015, following which DULBERG and the Defendants terminated their relationship due to a claimed failure of communication. MAST and POPOVICH withdrew from the representation of DULBERG.

24. Thereafter, DULBERG retained other attorneys and proceeded to a Court ordered binding mediation before a retired Circuit Judge, where DULBERG received a binding mediation award of $660,000.00 in gross, and a net award of $561,000.00. However, due to the settlement with the McGuires, DULBERG was only able to collect $300,000.00 based upon the insurance policy available. A copy of the aforesaid Mediation Award is attached hereto as **Exhibit G.**

25. The McGuires were property owners and had property insurance covering injuries or losses on their property, as well as substantial personal assets, including the property location where the accident took place at 1016 West Elder Avenue, in the City of McHenry, Illinois. McGuires were well able to pay all, or a portion of the binding mediation award had they still remained parties.

26. DULBERG, in his relationship with POPOVICH and MAST, cooperated in all ways with them, furnishing all necessary information as required, and frequently conferred with them.

27. Until the time of the mediation award, DULBERG had no reason to believe he could not recover the full amount of his injuries, based on POPOVICH'S and MAST'S representations to DULBERG that he could recover the full amount of his injuries from Gagnon, and that the inclusion of the McGuires would only complicate the case.

Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377
Page 5 of 24

28. Following the execution of the mediation agreement and the final mediation award, DULBERG realized for the first time in December of 2016 that the information MAST and POPOVICH had given DULBERG was false and misleading, and that in fact, the dismissal of the McGuires was a serious and substantial mistake.

29. It was not until the mediation in December 2016, based on the expert's opinions that DULBERG retained for the mediation, that DULBERG became reasonably aware that MAST and POPOVICH did not properly represent him by pressuring and coercing him to accept a settlement for $5,000.00 on an "all or nothing" basis.

30. DULBERG was advised to seek an independent opinion from a legal malpractice attorney and received that opinion on or about December 16, 2016.

31. MAST and POPOVICH, jointly and severally, breached the duties owed DULBERG by violating the standard of care owed DULBERG in the following ways and respects:

a) Failed to take such actions as were necessary during their representation of DULBERG to fix liability against the property owners of the subject property (the McGuires) who employed Gagnon, and sought the assistance of DULBERG, for example hiring a liability expert;

b) Failed to thoroughly investigate liability issues against property owners of the subject property;

c) Failed to conduct necessary discovery, so as to fix the liability of the property owners to DULBERG, for example hiring a liability expert;

d.) Failed to investigate the insurance policy amounts of the McGuires and Gagnon;

e.) Incorrectly informed DULBERG that Gagnon's insurance policy was "only $100,000.00" and no insurance company would pay close to that;

Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377
Page 6 of 24

f) Failed to understand the law pertaining to a property owner's rights, duties and responsibilities to someone invited onto their property by consulting an expert regarding these issues;

g) Improperly urged DULBERG to accept a nonsensical settlement from the property owners, and dismissed them from all further responsibility;

h) Failed to appreciate and understand further moneys could not be received as against Gagnon, and that the McGuires and their obvious liability were a very necessary party to the litigation;

i) Falsely advised DULBERG throughout the period of their representation, that the actions taken regarding the McGuires was proper in all ways and respects, and that DULBERG had no choice but to accept the settlement;

j) Coerced DULBERG, verbally and through emails. into accepting the settlement with the McGuires for $5,000.00 by misleading him into believing that had no other choice but to accept the settlement or else "the McGuires will get out for FREE on a motion".

k) Concealed from DULBERG the necessary facts for him to make an informed decision as to the McGuires, instead coercing him verbally and through emails into signing a release and settlement agreement and accept a paltry sum of $5,000.00 for what was a grievous injury;

l) Failed to properly explain to DULBERG all ramifications of accepting the McGuire settlement, and giving him the option of retaining alternative counsel to review the matter;

m) Continually reassured DULBERG that the course of action as to the property owners was proper and appropriate;

Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377
Page 7 of 24

n) Failed to retain a liability expert to prove DULBERG's damages;

o) Were otherwise negligent in their representation of DULBERG.

32. That DULBERG suffered serious and substantial damages, not only as a result of the injury as set forth in the binding mediation award, but due to the direct actions of MAST and POPOVICH in urging DULBERG to release the McGuires, lost the sum of well over $300,000.00 which would not have occurred but for the acts of MAST and THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C.

WHEREFORE, your Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG prays this Honorable Court to enter judgment on such verdict as a jury of twelve (12) shall return, together with the costs of suit and such other and further relief as may be just, all in excess of the jurisdictional minimums of this Honorable Court.

Respectfully submitted by,

PAUL DULBERG, Plaintiff, by his attorneys THE GOOCH FIRM,



Thomas W. Gooch, III

PLAINTIFF HEREBY DEMANDS A TRIAL BY JURY OF TWELVE (12) PERSONS.



Thomas W. Gooch, III

Thomas W. Gooch, III
THE GOOCH FIRM
209 S. Main Street
Wauconda, IL 60084
847-526-0110
ARDC No.: 3123355
gooch@goochfirm.com
office@goochfirm.com

Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377
Page 8 of 24

CONTRACT FOR LEGAL SERVICES

I agree to employ the LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C. (hereinafter "my attorney") to represent me in the prosecution or settlement of my claim against persons or entities responsible for causing me to suffer injuries and damages on the _____ day of _____, 20__.

My attorney agrees to make no charge for legal services unless a recovery is made in my claim. The approval of any settlement amount cannot be made without my knowledge and consent.

I agree to pay my attorney in consideration for his legal services a sum equal to one-third (33 1/3%) of my recovery from my claim by suit or settlement; this will increase to 40% in the event my claim results in more than one (1) trial and/or an appeal of a trial. I understand my attorney may need to incur reasonable expenses in properly handling my claim including, but not limited to, expenses such as accident reports, filing fees, court reporters fees, video fees, records fees, and physician fees. I understand those expenses will be taken out of my settlement, in addition to my attorney's legal fee.

Client

Client

Date: _____

LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH

By: _____

Date: _____

LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C.
3416 West Elm Street
McHenry, Illinois 60050
815/344-3797

EXHIBIT
tabbies
A

COPY

MAY 15 2012

KATHERINE M. KEEFE, McHENRY CTY. CIR. CLK.

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
)SS
COUNTY OF McHENRY)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
McHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PAUL DULBERG,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DAVID GAGNON, Individually, and as Agent of CAROLINE MCGUIRE and BILL MCGUIRE, and CAROLINE MCGUIRE and BILL MCGUIRE, Individually,

Defendants.

No.: 12LA178

COMPLAINT

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, by his attorneys, LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C., and complaining against the Defendants, DAVID GAGNON, Individually, and as Agent of CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, and CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, Individually, and states as follows:

Count I

Paul Dulberg vs. David Gagnon, individually, and as Agent of Caroline and Bill McGuire

1. On June 28, 2011, the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, lived in the City of McHenry, County of McHenry, Illinois.

2. On June 28, 2011, Defendants CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE lived, controlled, managed and maintained a single family home located at 1016 W. Elder Avenue, in the City of McHenry, County of McHenry, Illinois.

NOTICE
BY LOCAL RULE 3.10
THIS CASE IS HEREBY SET FOR SCHEDULING CONFERENCE IN COURTROOM 206 ON 11/15/2012 AT 8:30 AM/PM
FAILURE TO APPEAR MAY RESULT IN THE CASE BEING DISMISSED OR AN ORDER OF DEFAULT BEING ENTERED.

NOTICE
BY LOCAL RULE 3.10
THIS CASE IS HEREBY SET FOR SCHEDULING CONFERENCE IN COURTROOM ____ ON ____ AT ____ AM/PM
FAILURE TO APPEAR MAY RESULT IN THE CASE BEING DISMISSED OR AN ORDER OF DEFAULT BEING ENTERED.

EXHIBIT
B

3. On June 28, 2011, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was living and/or staying at his parent's home at 1016 W. Elder Avenue, in the City of McHenry, County of McHenry, Illinois.

4. On June 28, 2011, the Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE contracted, hired the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, to cut down, trim and/or maintain the trees and brush at their premises at 1016 W. Elder Avenue, in the City of McHenry, County of McHenry, Illinois.

5. On June 28, 2011, and at the request and with the authority and permission of the Defendants CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, and for their benefit, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was working under their supervision and control while engaged in cutting, trimming and maintaining trees and brush at the premises at 1016 W. Elder Avenue, in the City of McHenry, County of McHenry, Illinois.

6. On June 28, 2011, as part of his work at the subject property, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was authorized, instructed, advised and permitted to use a chainsaw to assist him in his work for Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, which was owned by the McGuires.

7. On June 28, 2011, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was under the supervision and control of Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, and was working as their apparent and actual agent, and was then acting and working in the scope of his agency for Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE.

Received 11-28-2017 04:31 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 11-29-2017 09:53 AM / Transaction #17111117451 / Case #17LA000377
Page 10 of 19
Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377
Page 11 of 24

8. On June 28, 2011, and while the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was working in the course and scope of his agency for Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, and was under their supervision and control, Defendant, DAVID GAGNON was in use of a chainsaw while trimming a tree and branch.

9. On June 28, 2011, and while Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was in use of a chainsaw while trimming a tree and branch, Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, asked for and/or requested the assistance of the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, to hold the tree branch while Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, trimmed the branch with the chainsaw.

10. On June 28, 2011, and while Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was in sole control, use and operation of the subject chainsaw, the chainsaw was caused to strike and injure the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG.

11. At all relevant times, Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, knew of Defendant, DAVID GAGNON's use of the chainsaw in the presence of the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, and knew that such created a danger to the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG's safety.

12. That at all relevant times, the Defendants, DAVID GAGNON, as agent of CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, owed a duty to use care and caution in his operation of a known dangerous instrumentality.

Received 11-28-2017 04:31 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 11-29-2017 09:53 AM / Transaction #17111117451 / Case #17LA000377
Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377

13. On June 28, 2011, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was negligent in one or more of the following ways:

a. Failed to maintain control over the operating of the chainsaw;

b. Failed to take precaution not to allow the chainsaw to move toward the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, so as to cause injury;

c. Failed to warn the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, of the dangers existing from the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON's inability to control the chainsaw;

d. Failed to keep a proper distance from the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, while operating the chainsaw;

e. Otherwise was negligent in operation and control of the chainsaw.

14. That as a proximate result of the Defendant's negligence, the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, was injured externally; he has experienced and will in the future experience pain and suffering; he has been permanently scarred and/or disabled; and has become obligated for large sums of money for medical bills and will in the future become obligated for additional sums of money for medical care, and has lost time from work and/or from earning wages due to such injury.

15. That at the above time and date, the Defendant's negligence can be inferred from the circumstances of the occurrence as the instrument of the injury was under the control of the Defendant and therefore, negligence can be presumed under the doctrine of *Res Ipsa Loquitur*.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, demands judgment against Defendants, DAVID GAGNON, and CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE in an amount in excess of $50,000.00, plus costs of this action.

Received 11-28-2017 04:31 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 11-29-2017 09:53 AM / Transaction #17111117451 / Case #17LA000377
Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377

Count II

Paul Dulberg vs. Caroline McGuire and Bill McGuire

1 - 15. That the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, restates and realleges paragraphs 1 through 14, in Count I, above, as paragraphs 1 through 15 of Count II, as if fully alleged herein.

16. That at all relevant times, the Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, owned, controlled, maintained and supervised the premises whereat the accident to the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, occurred.

17. That at all relevant times, the Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, were in control of and had the right to advise, instruct and demand that the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, act or work in a safe and reasonable manner.

18. That at all relevant times, the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON, was acting as the agent, actual and apparent, of Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, and was acting at their request and in their best interests and to their benefit as in a joint enterprise.

19. That at all relevant times, Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, knew DAVID GAGNON was operating a chainsaw with the assistance of the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, and had the right to discharge or terminate the Defendant, DAVID GAGNON's work for any reason.

20. That at all relevant times, Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, owed a duty to supervise and control Defendant, DAVID GAGNON's activities on the property so as not to create a unreasonable hazard to others, including the Plaintiff, PUAL DULBERG.

Received 11-28-2017 04:31 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 11-29-2017 09:53 AM / Transaction #17111117451 / Case #17LA000377
Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377

21. On June 28, 2011, the Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, were negligent in one or more of the following ways:

a. Failed to control operation of the chainsaw;

b. Failed to take precaution not to allow the chainsaw to move toward the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, so as to cause injury;

c. Failed to warn the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, of the dangers existing from the Defendant's inability to control the chainsaw;

d. Failed to keep the chainsaw a proper distance from the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, while operating the chainsaw;

e. Otherwise was negligent in operation and control of the chainsaw.

22. That as a proximate result of the Defendant's negligence, the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, was injured externally; he has experienced and will in the future experience pain and suffering, he has been permanently scarred and/or disabled; and has become obligated for large sums of money for medical bills and will in the future become obligated for additional sums of money for medical care, and has lost time from work and/or from earning wages due to such injury.

Received 11-28-2017 04:31 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 11-29-2017 09:53 AM / Transaction #17111117451 / Case #17LA000377
Page 14 of 19
Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377
Page 15 of 24

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, demands judgment against Defendants, CAROLINE McGUIRE and BILL McGUIRE, in an amount in excess of $50,000.00, plus costs of this action.

LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C.

One of the Attorneys for Plaintiff

Hans A. Mast
LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. POPOVICH, P.C.
3416 West Elm Street
Lake, Illinois 60050
(815) 344-3797
ARDC No. 06203684

Received 11-28-2017 04:31 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 11-29-2017 09:53 AM / Transaction #17111117461 / Case #17LA000377
Page 15 of 19
Received 06-07-2018 01:29 PM / Circuit Clerk Accepted on 06-07-2018 03:53 PM / Transaction #17111166062 / Case #17LA000377
Page 16 of 24

From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Subject: **Fwd: Dave's Best and oldest friend John**
Date: December 28, 2016 10:33:35 AM CST
To: paul_dulberg@comcast.net

From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Date: November 20, 2013 at 7:26:53 AM CST
To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
Subject: Re: Dave's Best and oldest friend John

Morning Hans,
Ok we can meet. I will call Sheila today and set up a time.
Please send me a link to the current Illinois statute citing that the property owner is not liable for work done on their property resulting in injury to a neighbor.
I need to read it myself and any links to recent case law in this area would be helpful as well.
Thanks,
Paul

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250
Sent from my iPad

> On Nov 20, 2013, at 6:59 AM, Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net> wrote:
>
> Paul, lets meet again to discuss. The legality of it all is that a property owner does not have legal liability for a worker (whether friend, son or otherwise) who does the work on his time, using his own independent skills. Here, I deposed the McGuires, and they had nothing to do with how Dave did the work other than to request the work to be done. They had no control on how Dave wielded the chain saw and cut you. Its that simple. We don't have to accept the $5,000, but if we do not, the McGuires will get out for FREE on a motion. So that's the situation.
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
> To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
> Sent: Tue, 19 Nov 2013 02:29:56 -0000 (UTC)
> Subject: Re: Dave's Best and oldest friend John
> I still don't get how they don't feel responsible for work done on their property by their own son that ended up cutting through 40% of my arm.
> Perhaps their negligence is the fact that they didn't supervise the work close enough but they did oversee much of the days activity with David. Just because Dave was doing the work doesn't mean they were not trying to tell their kid what to do. They told him plenty of times throughout the day what to do. How is that not supervising?
> Paul
> Paul Dulberg
> 847-497-4250
> Sent from my iPad
>
> > On Nov 18, 2013, at 9:07 PM, Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net> wrote:
> >
> > Paul whether you like it or not they don't have a legal liability for your injury because they were not directing the work. So if we do not accept their 5000 they will simply file a motion and get out of the case for free. That's the only other option is letting them file motion getting out of the case
> >
> > Sent from my iPhone
> >
> > > On Nov 18, 2013, at 7:40 PM, Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > Only 5, That's not much at all.
> > > Is this a take it or leave it or do we have any other options?
> > >
> > > If you want a negligence case for the homeowners ask what happened immediately after the accident.
> > >
> > > Neither of them offered me any medical assistance nor did either of them call 911 and all Carol could think of besides calling David an idiot was calling her homeowners insurance.



They all left me out in the yard screaming for help while they were busy making sure they were covered.

She even went as far as to finally call the Emergency Room after I was already there just to tell me she was covered.

How selfish are people when they worry about if their insured over helping the person who was hurt and bleeding badly in their yard.

I'm glad she got her answer and had to share it with me only to find out her coverage won't even pay the medical bills.

I'm not happy with the offer.

As far as John Choyinski, he knows he has to call you and said he will tomorrow.

Paul

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250
Sent from my iPad

> On Nov 18, 2013, at 1:28 PM, Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net> wrote:
>
> Im waiting to hear from John. I tried calling him last week, but no one answered.
>
> In addition, the McGuire's atty has offered us (you) $5,000 in full settlement of the claim against the McGuires only. As we discussed, they have no liability in the case for what Dave did as property owners. So they will likely get out of the case on a motion at some point, so my suggestion is to take the $5,000 now. You probably won't see any of it due to liens etc. but it will offset the costs deducted from any eventual recovery....
>
> Let me know what you think..
>
> Hans
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
> To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
> Sent: Fri, 15 Nov 2013 22:41:26 -0000 (UTC)
> Subject: Dave's Best and oldest friend John
> Hans,
> Just spoke with John Choyinski again about talking with you.
> I am leaving your number with him as he has agreed to talk with you about David Gagnon.
> I believe he will try and call sometime tomorrow.
> Paul
> Oh and I know that nothing that happened right after the incident makes any difference as to the validity of the injuries but David's conduct immediately after the incident does show his lack of moral values for other humans and what he was willing and was not willing to do to help me get medical help. For his actions towards me or any other human being is enough to sue the shit out him alone. It is the things that happened afterwards that upset me the most.
> Sorry for the rant but Dave was a complete ass all the way and deserves this.
> Paul Dulberg
> 847-497-4250
> Sent from my iPad

The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich P.C.

3416 W. Elm Street
McHenry, Illinois 60050
Telephone: 815.344.3797
Facsimile: 815.344.5280
www.popovichlaw.com

Thomas J. Popovich
Hans A. Mast
John A. Kornak

Mark J. Vogg
James P. Tutaj
Robert J. Lumber
Theresa M. Freeman

January 24, 2014

Paul Dulberg
4606 Hayden Court
McHenry, IL 60051

RE: ***Paul Dulberg vs. David Gagnon, Caroline McGuire and Bill McGuire***
McHenry County Case: 12 LA 178

Dear Paul:

Please find enclosed the General Release and Settlement Agreement from defense counsel for Caroline and Bill McGuire. Please Release and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

COPY
HANS A. MAST

smq
Enclosure

EXHIBIT
tabbies
D

Waukegan Office
210 North Martin Luther
King Jr. Avenue
Waukegan, IL 60085

GENERAL RELEASE AND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

NOW COMES PAUL DULBERG, and in consideration of the payment of Five-Thousand ($5,000.00) Dollars to him, by or on behalf of the WILLIAM MCGUIRE and CAROLYN MCGUIRE (aka Bill McGuire; improperly named as Caroline McGuire) and AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE COMPANY, the payment and receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, PAUL DULBERG does hereby release and discharge the WILLIAM MCGUIRE and CAROLYN MCGUIRE and AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE COMPANY, and any agents or employees of the WILLIAM MCGUIRE and CAROLYN MCGUIRE and AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE COMPANY, of and from any and all causes of action, claims and demands of whatsoever kind or nature including, but not limited to, any claim for personal injuries and property damage arising out of a certain chain saw incident that allegedly occurred on or about June 28, 2011, within and upon the premises known commonly as 1016 West Elder Avenue, City of McHenry, County of McHenry, State of Illinois.

IT IS FURTHER AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD that there is presently pending a cause of action in the Circuit Court of the 22nd Judicial Circuit, McHenry County, Illinois entitled "Paul Dulberg, Plaintiff, vs. David Gagnon, Individually, and as agent of Caroline McGuire and Bill McGuire, and Caroline McGuire and Bill McGuire, Individually, Defendants", Cause No. 2012 LA 178, and that this settlement is contingent upon WILLIAM McGUIRE and CAROLYN McGUIRE being dismissed with prejudice as parties to said lawsuit pursuant to a finding by the Circuit Court that the settlement between the parties constitutes a good faith settlement for purposes of the Illinois Joint Tortfeasor Contribution Act, 740 ILCS 100/0.01, *et seq.*

IT IS FURTHER AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD that as part of the consideration for this agreement the undersigned represents and warrants as follows (check applicable boxes):

- ☐ I was not 65 or older on the date of the occurrence.
- ☐ I was not receiving SSI or SSDI on the date of the occurrence.
- ☐ I am not eligible to receive SSI or SSDI.
- ☐ I am not currently receiving SSI or SSDI.

IT IS FURTHER AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD:

a. That any subrogated claims or liens for medical expenses paid by or on behalf of PAUL DULBERG shall be the responsibility PAUL DULBERG, including, but not limited to, any Medicare liens. Any and all reimbursements of medical expenses to subrogated parties, including Medicare's rights of reimbursement, if any, shall be PAUL DULBERG's responsibility, and not the responsibility of the parties released herein.

b. That any outstanding medical expenses are PAUL DULBERG's responsibility and all payment of medical expenses hereafter shall be PAUL DULBERG's responsibility, and not the responsibility of the parties released

c. That PAUL DULBERG agrees to save and hold harmless and indemnify the parties released herein against any claims made by any medical providers, including, but not limited to Medicare or parties subrogated to the rights to recover medical or Medicare payments.

IT IS FURTHER AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD by the parties hereto that this agreement contains the entire agreement between the parties with regard to materials set forth herein, and shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the parties hereto, jointly and severally, and the executors, conservators, administrators, guardians, personal representatives, heirs and successors of each.

IT IS FURTHER AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD that this settlement is a compromise of a doubtful and disputed claim and no liability is admitted as a consequence hereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal on the dates set forth below.

Dated: _____

PAUL DULBERG

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF MCHENRY)

PAUL DULBERG personally appeared before me this date and acknowledged that she executed the foregoing Release and Settlement Agreement as his own free act and deed for the uses and purposes set forth therein.

Dated this _____ day of January, 2014.

Notary Public

From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Subject: **Fwd: McGuire settlement**
Date: December 28, 2016 10:21:55 AM CST
To: paul_dulberg@comcast.net

From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Date: January 29, 2014 at 1:59:31 PM CST
To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
Subject: Re: McGuire settlement

Ok, It's signed and in the mail.
Hope that some yahoo in the govt. doesn't someday decide to go after everyone they think they might get a dollar out of and end up holding me responsible for the McGuires fees incurred while they fight it out.
I'm not in the business of warranting, insuring or protecting the McGuires from government. Especially for only 5 grand. For that kind of protection it could cost millions but I trust your judgement.
Paul

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250
Sent from my iPad

> On Jan 29, 2014, at 11:49 AM, Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net> wrote:
>
> SSD has to be part of it...its not going to effect anything...
> We can't prevent disclosure of the amount...
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
> To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
> Sent: Wed, 29 Jan 2014 17:47:39 -0000 (UTC)
> Subject: Re: McGuire settlement
> What and why do those questions have any relevance at all and why do they need to be part of this agreement?
> Particularly the one about being eligible.
> Also, I cannot warranty against what SSDI, Medicare or any other government institution wishes to do.
> Is it possible to make this agreement blind to the McGuires or David Gagnon?
> What I mean is can we make it so that the amount of money cannot be told to them in any way?
> It would drive David's ego crazy if he thought it was a large sum and was banned from seeing how much it is.
> Paul Dulberg
> 847-497-4250
> Sent from my iPad
>> On Jan 29, 2014, at 10:51 AM, Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net> wrote:
>>
>> Its not a big deal...if you weren't receiving it than don't check it...not sure what the question is...
>> ----- Original Message -----
>> From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
>> To: Hans Mast <hansmast@comcast.net>
>> Sent: Wed, 29 Jan 2014 16:16:04 -0000 (UTC)
>> Subject: McGuire settlement
>> Here is a copy of the first page.
>> It has check boxes and one of the check boxes says;
>> I am not eligible to receive SSI or SSDI.
>> Another says;
>> I am not receiving SSI or SSDI.
>> As you know, I have applied for SSDI and SSI

EXHIBIT
tabbies
F

From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Subject: **Fwd: Memo**
Date: December 27, 2016 6:11:20 PM CST
To: paul_dulberg@comcast.net

From: Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Date: February 22, 2015 at 7:42:25 PM CST
To: Hans Mast <hansmast@att.net>
Subject: Re: Memo

To believe David's version of events you must believe I was committing suicide.
Who in their right mind puts his arm into a chainsaw?

I figured you would cop out again...

Now I'm left wondering...
How hard is it to sue an atty?

And yes I am and have been looking for someone who will take this case...

The issue of my word vs David Gagnons... Did he cut me or did I cut myself?

Of coarse he cut me.

Next issue please?

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250
Sent from my iPad

> On Feb 22, 2015, at 7:20 PM, Hans Mast <hansmast@att.net> wrote:
>
> Paul I no longer can represent you in the case. We obviously have differences of opinion as to the value of the case. I've been telling you over a year now the problems with the case and you just don't see them. You keep telling me how injured you are and completely ignore that it doesn't matter if you passed away from the accident because we still have to prove that the defendant was at fault. While you think it is very clear - it is not. My guess is that seven out of 10 times you will lose the case outright. That means zero. That's why I have been trying to convince you to agree to a settlement. You clearly do not want to. There's only $100,000 in coverage. Allstate will never offer anything near the policy limits therefore there's no chance to settle the case. The only alternative is to take the case to trial and I am not interested in doing that. I will wait for you to find a new attorney. I can't assist you any further in this case. Just let me know.
>
> Sent from my IPhone
>
> > On Feb 22, 2015, at 7:14 PM, Paul Dulberg <pdulberg@comcast.net> wrote:
> >
> > Let's not be harsh, We have a couple of weeks till dr Kujawa's billing arrives.
> > I agree showing me the memo is a good idea it's just not the accuracy I expected.
> > I know I'm being confrontative about all of this but let's face it, my working days are over let alone a career I have been building since I was in high school. My dreams of family are over unless I have enough to provide and pay for the care of children and a roof.
> > What's left for me?
> > Facebook, scrap booking, crafts, etc... A life of crap...
> > With ongoing pain and grip issues in my dominate arm/hand that are degenerative.
> >
> > This is as total as it gets for us in the working class short of being paralyzed or dead.
> >
> > I need someone who is on my side, top of their game and will see to it that I'm comfortable after all this is over.
> >
> > What I feel is an attempt to settle for far less than this is remotely worth just to get me off the books.



ADR systems

Binding Mediation Award

Paul Dulberg

v.

David Gagnon

ADR Systems File # 33391BMAG

On December 8, 2016, the matter was called for binding mediation before the Honorable James P. Etchingham, (Ret.), in Chicago, IL. According to the agreement entered into by the parties, if a voluntary settlement through negotiation could not be reached the mediator would render a settlement award which would be binding to the parties. Pursuant to that agreement the mediator finds as follows:

Finding in favor of: Paul Dulberg

Gross Award: $660,000.

Comparative fault: 15 % (if applicable)

Net Award: $561,000

Comments/Explanation

Medical	$ 60,000.
Future medical	$ 200,000.
Lost wage	$ 250,000.
P.I.S	75,000.
L.N.L	75,000.

The Honorable James P. Etchingham, (Ret.)

EXHIBIT 6

From: **Office Office** office@goochfirm.com
Subject: RE: Dulberg v. The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich
Date: July 6, 2018 at 11:25 AM
To: me pdulberg@comcast.net
Cc: Thomas W. Gooch III gooch@goochfirm.com, Sabina Walczyk swalczyk@goochfirm.com, Nikki nikki@goochfirm.com

I will find out from the attorney and let you know. It really depends on the Judge.

I will let Tom & Sabina know.

Thank you and have a great weekend!

Melissa J. Podgorski
Paralegal
The Gooch Firm
209 South Main Street
Wauconda, Illinois 60084
(847) 526-0110 (phone)
(847) 526-0603 (fax)

-----Original Message-----
From: me <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 6, 2018 11:13 AM
To: Office Office <office@goochfirm.com>
Cc: Thomas W. Gooch III <gooch@goochfirm.com>; Sabina Walczyk <swalczyk@goochfirm.com>; Nikki <nikki@goochfirm.com>
Subject: Re: Dulberg v. The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich

Hi Melissa,

Thank you for a copy of the defendants motion to dismiss.
I will read this in detail over the next few days.

Please let me know of anything in this motion that is remotely concerning or gives the defendant a leg to stand on.

Please let Tom and Sabina know that I will provide anything they feel they need to defeat the defendants motion.

Thank you again,
Paul

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250

On 7/6/2018 9:12 AM, Office Office wrote:

> Dear Mr. Dulberg,
>
> Sorry for the inconvenience, we did receive the attached Motion to Dismiss from the Defendant's yesterday. For some reason it was in my junk email.
>
> Please note they set their motion for July 20, 2018. We will keep you advised of what transpires in Court that day. Also, please know that them filing a Motion to Dismiss is most common in response to a Complaint. The Judge will hear their motion and decide if he will allow it or not. If he does, we will have to file a response to their Motion to Dismiss. If the Judge denies their motion, we will have to amend the Complaint.
>
> Basically, you have nothing to worry about at this time. This matter will not be dismissed based on that motion.
>
> If you have any questions, please let me know.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Melissa J. Podgorski

Melissa S. Podgorski
Paralegal
The Gooch Firm
209 South Main Street
Wauconda, Illinois 60084
(847) 526-0110 (phone)
(847) 526-0603 (fax)

From: **Sabina Walczyk** swalczyk@goochfirm.com
Subject: RE: Dulberg v. The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich
Date: July 11, 2018 at 4:24 PM
To: me pdulberg@comcast.net

SW

Hi Paul,
So the last court order states that we have a status of pleadings on July 20, 2018.

On this date, since the Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss, the Court will give us the briefing schedule--setting out when our Response is due, when their Reply is due and when the hearing will be set.

So to answer your question, the briefing schedule gives us the due date, which we will know what it is on the next court date. Please let me know if that answered your question.

Sabina D. Walczyk
Associate Attorney
The Gooch Firm
209 South Main Street
Wauconda, Illinois 60084
(847) 526-0110 (phone)
(847) 526-0603 (fax)

-----Original Message-----
From: me <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 4:15 PM
To: Sabina Walczyk <swalczyk@goochfirm.com>
Subject: Re: Dulberg v. The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich

Hi Sabina,
ok i'm confused
Is the briefing schedule not the due date for our response?

On 7/11/2018 4:09 PM, Sabina Walczyk wrote:

> Hi Paul,
> Thanks for the information.
> We do not have a due date yet for our response but I have saved this information and will use it when we start drafting the response.
> We will enter into a briefing schedule on the next court date, July 20, 2018.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Sabina D. Walczyk
> Associate Attorney
> The Gooch Firm
> 209 South Main Street
> Wauconda, Illinois 60084
> (847) 526-0110 (phone)
> (847) 526-0603 (fax)
>
> This communication is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, found at 18 U.S.C. 2510 et. seq. and is intended to remain confidential and is subject to applicable attorney/client and/or work product privileges. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply e-mail and then delete this message and all attachments. Do not deliver, distribute or copy this message and/or any attachments and if you are not the intended recipient, do not disclose the contents or take any action in reliance upon the information contained in this communication or any attachments.
>
> -----Original Message-----

Original Message
From: me <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 4:01 PM
To: Office Office <office@goochfirm.com>
Cc: Thomas W. Gooch III <gooch@goochfirm.com>; Sabina Walczyk <swalczyk@goochfirm.com>; Nikki <nikki@goochfirm.com>
Subject: Re: Dulberg v. The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich

Hi Tom & Sabina,

Please find the attached file
DULBERG-AMENDED-COMPLAINT-MOTION-TO-DISMISS-REPLY.txt

Note: The Mast to Barch letter dated December 26th, 2013 is in the files I last brought to your office and should be added as an exhibit.
If you need another copy please let me know.

If you have any problems with the attached file please let me know.

Thank you,
Paul
847-497-4250

On 7/10/2018 2:05 PM, me wrote:

> Hi Tom and Sabina,
> Just wanted to touch base and let you know that by sometime tomorrow I should have a very detailed response to questions at the heart of the defendants motion to dismiss for you to review and will get it to you via email.
>
> Please give me a call or lets set up an appointment time, There are a few things I'd like to discuss...
> a.) Hiring a premises liability expert specializing in ultrahazardous situations (I realized that the Chainsaw expert I hired (Dr. Lanford) for the case against GAGNON only spoke of the MCGUIRES partial liability as the owners of the chainsaw, not as The owners of the property and the premises liability issue. I believe these are two very different liabilities and must be addressed.)
>
> b.) Hiring a premises liability attorney specializing in ultrahazardous situations (To argue any mock trial or whatever it is that needs to be done for us that may very well be in our future)
>
> c.) Discuss the pros and cons of accepting the GAGNON award amounts vs. a separate trial over the MCGUIRES homeowners liabilities and responsibilities under ultrahazardous situations. (chainsaws and felling trees puts this in a whole new catagory of Ultrahazardous situations and I believe moves us from "reasonable care for invitees or licensees" to "strict liability" against the homeowners
>
> If I am correct about the change in level of liabilities, which I am pretty darn positive I am, It further shows how Mast and Popovich completely dropped the ball and mishandled this case.
>
> Thank you both for so much,
> Paul
> 847-497-4250
>
> On 7/6/2018 11:23 AM, Office Office wrote:
>
> > I will find out from the attorney and let you know. It really depends on the Judge.
> >
> > I will let Tom & Sabina know.
> >
> > Thank you and have a great weekend!
> >
> > Melissa J. Podgorski
> > Paralegal
> > The Gooch Firm
> > 209 South Main Street

209 South Main Street
Wauconda, Illinois 60084
(847) 526-0110 (phone)
(847) 526-0603 (fax)

-----Original Message-----
From: me <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 6, 2018 11:13 AM
To: Office Office <office@goochfirm.com>
Cc: Thomas W. Gooch III <gooch@goochfirm.com>; Sabina Walczyk <swalczyk@goochfirm.com>; Nikki <nikki@goochfirm.com>
Subject: Re: Dulberg v. The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich

Hi Melissa,

Thank you for a copy of the defendants motion to dismiss.
I will read this in detail over the next few days.

Please let me know of anything in this motion that is remotely concerning or gives the defendant a leg to stand on.

Please let Tom and Sabina know that I will provide anything they feel they need to defeat the defendants motion.

Thank you again,
Paul

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250

On 7/6/2018 9:12 AM, Office Office wrote:

> Dear Mr. Dulberg,
>
> Sorry for the inconvenience, we did receive the attached Motion to Dismiss from the Defendant's yesterday. For some reason it was in my junk email.
>
> Please note they set their motion for July 20, 2018. We will keep you advised of what transpires in Court that day. Also, please know that them filing a Motion to Dismiss is most common in response to a Complaint. The Judge will hear their motion and decide if he will allow it or not. If he does, we will have to file a response to their Motion to Dismiss. If the Judge denies their motion, we will have to amend the Complaint.
>
> Basically, you have nothing to worry about at this time. This matter will not be dismissed based on that motion.
>
> If you have any questions, please let me know.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Melissa J. Podgorski
> Paralegal
> The Gooch Firm
> 209 South Main Street

Wauconda, Illinois 60084
(847) 526-0110 (phone)
(847) 526-0603 (fax)

From: **Sabina Walczyk** swalczyk@goochfirm.com
Subject: RE: Dulberg v. The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich
Date: July 11, 2018 at 4:11 PM
To: me pdulberg@comcast.net

SW

Hi Paul,
Thanks for the information.
We do not have a due date yet for our response but I have saved this information and will use it when we start drafting the response.
We will enter into a briefing schedule on the next court date, July 20, 2018.

Thanks,

Sabina D. Walczyk
Associate Attorney
The Gooch Firm
209 South Main Street
Wauconda, Illinois 60084
(847) 526-0110 (phone)
(847) 526-0603 (fax)

-----Original Message-----
From: me <pdulberg@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 4:01 PM
To: Office Office <office@goochfirm.com>
Cc: Thomas W. Gooch III <gooch@goochfirm.com>; Sabina Walczyk <swalczyk@goochfirm.com>; Nikki <nikki@goochfirm.com>
Subject: Re: Dulberg v. The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich

Hi Tom & Sabina,

Please find the attached file
DULBERG-AMENDED-COMPLAINT-MOTION-TO-DISMISS-REPLY.txt

Note: The Mast to Barch letter dated December 26th, 2013 is in the files I last brought to your office and should be added as an exhibit.
If you need another copy please let me know.

If you have any problems with the attached file please let me know.

Thank you,
Paul
847-497-4250

On 7/10/2018 2:05 PM, me wrote:

> Hi Tom and Sabina,
> Just wanted to touch base and let you know that by sometime tomorrow I should have a very detailed response to questions at the heart of the defendants motion to dismiss for you to review and will get it to you via email.
>
> Please give me a call or lets set up an appointment time, There are a few things I'd like to discuss...
> a.) Hiring a premises liability expert specializing in ultrahazardous situations (I realized that the Chainsaw expert I hired (Dr. Lanford) for the case against GAGNON only spoke of the MCGUIRES partial liability as the owners of the chainsaw, not as The owners of the property and the premises liability issue. I believe these are two very different liabilities and must be addressed.)
>
> b.) Hiring a premises liability attorney specializing in ultrahazardous situations (To argue any mock trial or whatever it is

ultrahazardous situations (To argue any mock trial or whatever it is that needs to be done for us that may very well be in our future)

c.) Discuss the pros and cons of accepting the GAGNON award amounts vs. a separate trial over the MCGUIRES homeowners liabilities and responsibilities under ultrahazardous situations. (chainsaws and felling trees puts this in a whole new catagory of Ultrahazardous situations and I believe moves us from "reasonable care for invitees or licensees" to "strict liability" against the homeowners

If I am correct about the change in level of liabilities, which I am pretty darn positive I am, It further shows how Mast and Popovich completely dropped the ball and mishandled this case.

Thank you both for so much,
Paul
847-497-4250

On 7/6/2018 11:23 AM, Office Office wrote:

> I will find out from the attorney and let you know. It really depends on the Judge.
>
> I will let Tom & Sabina know.
>
> Thank you and have a great weekend!
>
> Melissa J. Podgorski
> Paralegal
> The Gooch Firm
> 209 South Main Street
> Wauconda, Illinois 60084
> (847) 526-0110 (phone)
> (847) 526-0603 (fax)
>
> This communication is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, found at 18 U.S.C. 2510 et. seq. and is intended to remain confidential and is subject to applicable attorney/client and/or work product privileges. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply e-mail and then delete this message and all attachments. Do not deliver, distribute or copy this message and/or any attachments and if you are not the intended recipient, do not disclose the contents or take any action in reliance upon the information contained in this communication or any attachments.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: me <pdulberg@comcast.net>
> Sent: Friday, July 6, 2018 11:13 AM
> To: Office Office <office@goochfirm.com>
> Cc: Thomas W. Gooch III <gooch@goochfirm.com>; Sabina Walczyk <swalczyk@goochfirm.com>; Nikki <nikki@goochfirm.com>
> Subject: Re: Dulberg v. The Law Offices of Thomas J. Popovich
>
> Hi Melissa,
>
> Thank you for a copy of the defendants motion to dismiss.
> I will read this in detail over the next few days.
>
> Please let me know of anything in this motion that is remotely concerning or gives the defendant a leg to stand on.
>
> Please let Tom and Sabina know that I will provide anything they feel they need to defeat the defendants motion.
>
> Thank you again,
> Paul

Paul Dulberg
847-497-4250

On 7/6/2018 9:12 AM, Office Office wrote:

> Dear Mr. Dulberg,
>
> Sorry for the inconvenience, we did receive the attached Motion to Dismiss from the Defendant's yesterday. For some reason it was in my junk email.
>
> Please note they set their motion for July 20, 2018. We will keep you advised of what transpires in Court that day. Also, please know that them filing a Motion to Dismiss is most common in response to a Complaint. The Judge will hear their motion and decide if he will allow it or not. If he does, we will have to file a response to their Motion to Dismiss. If the Judge denies their motion, we will have to amend the Complaint.
>
> Basically, you have nothing to worry about at this time. This matter will not be dismissed based on that motion.
>
> If you have any questions, please let me know.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Melissa J. Podgorski
> Paralegal
> The Gooch Firm
> 209 South Main Street
> Wauconda, Illinois 60084
> (847) 526-0110 (phone)
> (847) 526-0603 (fax)
>
>