

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.	)	

SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT AT LAW

Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG (hereinafter also referred to as “DULBERG”), by and through his attorneys, THE CLINTON LAW FIRM, LLC, complains 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”), as follows:

**COUNT I
LEGAL MALPRACTICE**

A. Parties and Venue

1. Paul Dulberg, is a resident of McHenry County, Illinois, and was such a resident at all times complained of herein.

2. The Law Offices of Thomas 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. Hans Mast is an agent, employee, or partner of The Law Offices of Thomas Popovich, P.C., and is a licensed attorney in the State of Illinois, and was so licensed at all times relevant to this Complaint.

4. As an agent, employee, or principal in Popovich, Popovich is liable for Mast's actions alleged herein.

5. Venue is 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.

B. Relevant Facts

6. On or about June 28, 2011, Dulberg assisted Caroline McGuire ("Caroline"), William McGuire ("Williams") (Caroline and William collectively referred to herein as "the McGuires"), and David Gagnon ("Gagnon") in cutting down a tree on the McGuire's property.

7. Dulberg lives in the next neighborhood over from the McGuire family.

8. Caroline McGuire and William McGuire are a married couple, who own real property in McHenry, McHenry County, Illinois ("the Property").

9. David Gagon is Caroline's son and William's stepson.

10. On June 28, 2011, at the Property, Gagnon was operating a chainsaw to remove branches from a tree and cut it down on the Property.

11. The McGuire's purchased and owned the chainsaw that was being utilized to trim, remove branches, and cut down the tree.

12. Dulberg was invited to the McGuire's property to see if he wanted any of the wood from the tree.

13. William physically assisted with cutting down the tree and, then, later supervised Gagnon's actions.

14. Caroline supervised Gagnon's and William's actions.

15. Gagnon and the McGuires asked Dulberg to assist with trimming and removal of the tree.
16. Gagnon was acting on behalf of Caroline and William and at their direction.
17. Caroline, William, and Gagnon all knew or should have known that a chainsaw was dangerous and to take appropriate precautions when utilizing the chain saw.
18. The safety information was readily available to Caroline and William as the safety instructions are included with the purchase of the chainsaw.
19. It is reasonably foreseeable that the failure to take appropriate caution and safety measures could result in serious injury.
20. The likelihood of injury when not properly utilizing the chainsaw or not following the safety precautions is very high.
21. The safety instructions outlined are easy to follow and do not place a large burden on the operator of the chainsaw or the owner of the property.
22. Caroline, William, and Gagnon had a duty to exercise appropriate caution and follow the safety instructions for the chainsaw.
23. Caroline, William, and Gagnon breached that duty by either not exercising appropriate care, failing to follow the safety instructions, or failing to instruct Gagnon to exercise appropriate care and/or follow the safety instructions.
24. Caroline and William, owners of the property and the chainsaw, instructed Gagnon to use the chain saw despite Gagnon not being trained in operating the chainsaw.
25. Gagnon was operating the chain saw in close proximity to Dulberg.
26. Neither Gagnon nor Dulberg were provided protective equipment when operating or assisting with operating the chainsaw.

27. Gagnon failed to utilize the chainsaw in compliance with the safety measures outlined in the owner's manual.

28. Caroline and William failed to instruct and require that Gagnon utilize the chainsaw only in compliance with the safety measures outlined in the owner's manual.

29. Gagnon lost control of the chainsaw that he was using and it struck Dulberg in the right arm, cutting him severely.

30. Dulberg incurred substantial and catastrophic injuries, including, but not limited to, pain and suffering, loss of use of his right arm, current and future medical expenses in amount in excess of \$260,000, lost wages in excess of \$250,000, and other damages.

31. In May 2012, Dulberg hired Mast and Popovich to represent him in prosecuting his claims against Gagnon and the McGuires. **Exhibit A.**

32. Mast and Popovich, on behalf of Dulberg filed a complaint against Gagnon and the McGuires. **Exhibit B.**

33. Mast and Popovich entered into an attorney client relationship with Dulberg.

34. Based upon the attorney client relationship, Mast and Popovich owed professional duties to Dulberg, including to a duty of care.

35. On behalf of Dulberg, Mast and Popovich prosecuted claims against both Gagnon and the McGuire's.

36. The claims against Gagnon were resolved later through binding mediation with new counsel.

37. The claims against the McGuires included (a) common law premises liability, (b) statutory premises liability, (c) common law negligence, and (d) vicarious liability for the acts of their son and agent.

38. In late 2013 or early, Mast urged Dulberg to settle the claims against the McGuire's for \$5,000.

39. 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 \$5,000 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.**)

40. 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.**)

41. On or around December 2013 or January 2014, Mast met with Dulberg 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.

42. During that same time frame, Mast advised Dulberg that the Restatement of Torts 318 was the only mechanism to recover from the McGuires and that Illinois did not recognize the Restate of Torts 318, thus Dulberg did not have any viable claims against the McGuires.

43. Mast failed to advise or inform Dulberg of other basis for recovery against the McGuires.

44. Based upon Mast's erroneously advice that Dulberg's claims against the McGuire's were not viable and that Dulberg would not recover if he pursued the claims, Dulberg settled with the McGuire's and their insurance company, Auto-Owners Insurance Company, for \$5,000, which included a release of all claims against the McGuire's and claim for indemnification under the McGuire's insurance policy. **Exhibit D (Settlement).**

45. Mast also told Dulberg that Gagnon's insurance policy was limited to \$100,000.

46. From 2013 forward, Mast and Popovich represented repeatedly to Dulberg that there was no possibility of any liability against William and/or Caroline McGuire and/or Auto-Owners Insurance Company, and led Dulberg to believe that the matter was being properly handled.

47. Mast also reassured Dulberg that Dulberg would be able to receive the full amount of any eventual recovery from Gagnon.

48. 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.**)

49. Mast and Popovich continued to represent Dulberg into 2015 and continuously assured him that his case was being handled properly.

50. The McGuires owned their home, had homeowner's insurance, and had other property that could have been utilized to pay a judgment against them and in favor of Dulberg.

51. Dulberg cooperated with and appropriately assisted Mast and Popovich in prosecuting the claims against Gagnon and the McGuires.

52. In December of 2016, Dulberg participated in binding mediation related to his claims against Gagnon.

53. In December of 2016, Dulberg was awarded a gross amount of \$660,000 and a net award of \$561,000 after his contributory negligence was considered.

54. Dulberg was only able to recovery approximately \$300,000 of the award from Gagnon's insurance and was unable to collect from Gagnon personally.

55. Only after Dulberg obtained an award against Gagnon did he discover that his claims against the McGuires were viable and valuable.

56. 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.

57. 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.

58. 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 fully and properly investigate the claims and/or basis for liability against the McGuires;

b) failed to properly obtain information through discovery regarding McGuires assets, insurance coverages, and/or ability to pay a judgement and/or settlement against them;

c) failed to accurately advise Dulberg of the McGuires' and Gagnon's insurance coverage related to the claims against them and/or Dulberg's ability to recover through McGuires' and Gagnon's insurance policies, including, but not limited to, incorrectly informing

Dulberg that Gagnon's insurance policy was "only \$100,000" and no insurance company would pay close to that;

d) failed to take such actions as were necessary during their respective representation of Dulberg to fix liability against the property owners of the subject property (the McGuires) who employed and/or were principals of Gagnon, and who sought the assistance Dulberg by for example failing to obtain an expert;

e) failed to accurately advise Dulberg regarding the McGuires' liability, likelihood of success of claims against the McGuires, the McGuires' ability pay any judgment or settlement against them through insurance or other assets, and/or necessity of prosecuting the all the claims against both the McGuires and Gagnon in order to obtain a full recovery;

f) Coerced Dulberg, verbally and through emails, into accepting a settlement with the McGuires for \$5,000 by misleading Dulberg into believing that he had no other choice but to accept the settlement or else "The McGuires will get out for FREE on a motion."

59. As a direct result of Mast and Popovich's wrongful actions, 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 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 Clinton Law Firm

/s/ Julia C. Williams
Julia C. Williams


Edward X. Clinton, Jr., ARDC No. 6206773
Julia C. Williams, ARDC No. 6296386
The Clinton Law Firm
111 W. Washington, Ste. 1437
Chicago, IL 60602
312.357.1515
ed@clintonlaw.net
juliawilliams@clintonlaw.net

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 ~~100~~ % 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

A

COPY
MAY 15 2012
KATHARINE M. KALPE,
McHENRY CITY CLERK

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF McHENRY)SS

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

PAUL DULBERG,
Plaintiff,

vs.

No.:

12LA178

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

Defendants.

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 1

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 20 ON
JUNE 28, 2012, AT 2:00 PM
FAILURE TO APPEAR MAY RESULT IN THE CASE
BEING DISMISSED OR AN ORDER OF
DEFAULT BEING ENTERED.

NOTICE
LOCAL RULE 3.10
THIS CASE IS HEREBY SET FOR SCHEDULING
CONFERENCE IN COURTROOM 20 ON
JUNE 28, 2012, AT 2:00 PM
FAILURE TO APPEAR MAY RESULT IN THE CASE
BEING DISMISSED OR AN ORDER OF
DEFAULT BEING ENTERED.

EXHIBIT

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.

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.

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

15. That the Plaintiff, PAUL DULBERG, restates and realleges paragraphs 1 through 14, in Count I, above, as paragraphs 1 through 13 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, not 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, PAUL DULBERG.

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

smg
Enclosure

EXHIBIT

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.





Binding Mediation Award

Paul Dulberg

v.

ADR Systems File # 33391BMAG

David Gagnon

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.PIS75,000.LNL75,000.

The Honorable James P. Etchingham, (Ret.)

