

Todd M. Feldman

Direct Dial: (954) 518-1216

Fax: (954) 518-8616

E-Mail: tfeldman@conroysimberg.com

Office Location: Hollywood

Todd M. Feldman, a partner in Conroy Simberg's Hollywood office, practices in the firm's recovery and subrogation division and handles cases throughout the region. Admitted to practice in all Florida state and federal courts, Todd concentrates in tort and insurance law, including professional and medical negligence, insurance coverage litigation, auto litigation, premises litigation and product liability. Prior to joining the firm, Todd handled cases in a wide range of practice areas, including, labor and employment defense, civil rights and police liability defense, contract disputes, and landlord/tenant matters. Active in several professional and civic organizations, Todd was selected as a Florida Super Lawyers Rising Star from 2013-2017.

Practice Areas:

- Subrogation

Admitted to Practice:

- Florida, 2007
- U.S. District Court Southern, District of Florida, 2008
- U.S. District Court Northern, District of Florida, 2009
- U.S. District Court Middle, District of Florida, 2010

Education:

- Florida State University College of Law, Juris Doctorate, 2006
 - Ralph R. Bailey Merit Scholarship Award Winner
 - Advisor, Leon County Teen Court Program
- University of Florida, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, 2003
 - Honors
 - Member, Racquetball Team

Honors & Awards:

- Florida Super Lawyers, Rising Star, 2013-2017
- South Florida Business & Wealth - 2018 Up & Comers Awards Finalist (Legal/Law Broward County)

Speaking Engagements:

- "Recovery and Subrogation Claims: Refreshers and Updates," Co-Presenter, Conroy Simberg Webinar, Conroy Simberg, April 2023
- "Recovery Case Review: Real Life Scenarios For Adjusters Pursuing or Defending Subrogation Claims," Conroy Simberg Webinar, Co-Presenter, April 2021
- "Preparation For Successful Subrogation," Conroy Simberg Webinar, October 2017
- "Subrogation Interpretation and Contemplation For Your Fascination,"



Conroy Simberg Annual Seminar, 2017

- "Help Us Help You: How To Properly Prepare Your Claim File for Subrogation," Conroy Simberg Annual Seminar, 2015
- "You've Got To Fight ... For Your Right ... For Recovery!!!" (Paying, Chasing and Post Claim Recovery), Conroy Simberg Annual Seminar, 2012

Representative Experience:

- *XYZ Insurance Company v. Refrigerator Manufacturer, et al*
 - This recovery case became a complex multi-party maritime and product liability action that arose out of a fire at a large marina in Miami that destroyed more than five yachts. XYZ Insurance Company expended \$1 million under the stated value policy for the insured vessel. The insured also alleged more than \$500,000.00 in additional unreimbursed damage associated with the loss. The vessel on which the fire originated filed a limitation proceeding in federal court under the federal maritime law. All of the vessels damaged or destroyed in the fire as well as their respective insurers, were brought into the suit. A multi-disciplinary forensic work up of the cause of the loss led us to the conclusion that the refrigerator in the vessel was the source of the fire. Further investigation led us to conclude that a defective relay switch within the refrigerator caused the fire and resulting damage. This effort resulted in settlement of the matter at mediation for a very significant six-figure sum. This was accomplished with a minimal amount of expense compared to the tens of thousands of additional dollars that would have been spent had the matter proceeded through trial.
- *XYZ Insurance Company v. Fire Sprinkler Pipe Installer, et al*
 - This case involved a residential apartment building insured by XYZ Insurance Company that was 99 percent complete. The loss occurred when a CPVC sprinkler pipe in an apartment on the 15th floor burst and flooded approximately seven floors below. XYZ Insurance Company paid its policy limits to the insured, \$1 million dollars, inclusive of the insured's \$100,000 dollar deductible. The case was originally filed against various entities for a product liability claim, as well as a negligence action against the sprinkler subcontractor.
 - After conducting the necessary product testing, a determination was made that the pipe in question was not defective and the products defendants were dismissed. Through the course of discovery, we learned that the exact pipe in question had a minor leak in the days prior to the loss, which the sprinkler subcontractor came out to repair. Based on the testimony we obtained, we were able to draw out inconsistencies in the statements of the employees and expose liability on the sprinkler subcontractor. Additionally, we learned through discovery that the general contractor in charge of the building construction also had some liability for the damages based on the actions taken by its employees after discovering the active water loss. Consequently, the general contractor was added as a defendant prior to this matter being mediated. This matter was eventually resolved at mediation, where we were able to obtain a recovery of approximately 70 percent of the value of the claim.