

Lara J. Edelstein

Direct Dial: (954) 518-1254

Fax: (954) 518-8674

E-Mail: ledelstein@conroysimberg.com

Office Location: Hollywood-Thomasville

Lara J. Edelstein, an associate based in the Hollywood office of Conroy Simberg, has extensive experience in appellate law and litigation support, having argued hundreds of cases in the circuit courts, the District Courts of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Florida. She also has experience in construction law, personal injury and first party matters. She is admitted to practice in all state and federal district courts in Florida. Lara is also admitted to practice in Georgia and regularly collaborates with the attorneys in Conroy Simberg's Thomasville, Ga. office.

Lara began her career as an Assistant Attorney General representing the State of Florida in criminal appellate proceedings. Lara also spent ten years as in-house appellate counsel to an automobile insurance carrier where she handled appeals and provided litigation support to the staff attorneys.

Practice Areas:

- Appellate
- Litigation Support
- First Party Property & Coverage
- Construction Litigation
- Insurance Fraud and Misrepresentation
- Insurance Coverage



Admitted to Practice:

- Florida, 1996
- Georgia, 1995
- United States Supreme Court
- U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida
- U.S. District Court, Northern District of Florida
- U.S. District Court, Middle District of Florida
- Supreme Court of Georgia
- Georgia Court of Appeals

Education:

- Western Michigan University Cooley Law School, 1995
- Florida State University, Bachelor of Arts in English, 1991

Professional Affiliations:

- North Dade Bar Association

Representative Experience:

United Auto. Ins. Co. v. Santa Fe Medical Center, 21 So.3d 60 (Fla. 3dDCA 2009)

- In this case, an insured's medical provider sought payment of PIP

benefits and was successful in the trial court and on appeal in the circuit court, sitting in its appellate capacity. On appeal to the Third District Court of Appeal, an en banc panel found that both the trial and circuit courts had incorrectly interpreted the language of subsections (4)(b) and (7)(a) of Florida's PIP statute, section 627.736.

- The Court clarified that subsection (4)(b) pertains to the thirty-day time period for payment of PIP benefits if the claim is reasonable, related, and necessary. "Reasonable proof" when defending an insurer's decision to deny payment of a claim under subsection (4)(b) does not require that the insurer obtain a valid report pursuant to subsection (7)(a), and the insurer may contest its responsibility to pay a claim at any time, and present evidence obtained after the thirty-day period has expired. Subsection (7)(a) only applies to instances where the insurer withdraws the payment of further PIP benefits, and not to the denial or reduction of the benefits claimed. Therefore, the insurer was not required to obtain a valid medical report in order to deny or reduce benefits and the circuit court's opinion was quashed.

United Auto. Ins. Co. v. Affiliated Healthcare Center, Inc., 20 Fla. L. Weekly Supp. 375a (Fla. 11th Cir. Jan. 22, 2013)

- Circuit court, sitting in its appellate capacity, reversed a judgment in favor of the plaintiff, an insured's medical provider, in a suit claiming PIP benefits. This was the second lawsuit filed by this medical provider on behalf of this patient for bills arising from injuries from a single automobile accident. In an opinion which thoroughly analyzed the doctrine of res judicata, the appellate court held that the final judgment in the provider's first lawsuit precluded a second lawsuit.