

Jordan S. Edelman Shareholder

Chicago, IL P: 312.792.9920 F: 312.782.9965 jsedelman@kopkalaw.com

ADMISSIONS

Illinois

U.S. District Court of the Northern District of Illinois

U.S. District Court for Central District of Illinois

U.S. District for Southern District of Illinois

EDUCATION

Loyola University Chicago School of Law, J.D.

University of Michigan, B.A.



Curriculum Vitae: Jordan S. Edelman

Jordan S. Edelman is a Shareholder in the Chicago office of Kopka Pinkus Dolin, representing clients in the defense of construction negligence, construction defect, professional negligence, premises transportation claims, long term care claims, civil rights disputes, and subrogation. Jordan has significant courtroom experience and has successfully tried to verdict, as lead counsel, numerous cases resulting in verdicts on behalf of his clients. Jordan has also mediated and arbitrated claims in numerous counties throughout Illinois and has appeared before each United States District Court within Illinois, as well as prepared briefs for the Illinois Appellate Court and Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. Jordan is also adept at negotiating settlement and has been instrumental in bringing closure to countless matters without the expense of prolonged defense.

Jordan has spoken and provided Continuing Legal Education seminars on the topic of negligence, claims handling, ethics, and specialized state specific topics. Jordan was named to the Super Lawyers Rising Star list in 2022. Such a distinction is awarded to the top 2.5% of all attorneys in Illinois as recognized by their peers.

Prior to joining KPD, Jordan was an associate with the Chicago office of a large national law firm specializing in insurance defense. He handled a variety of cases from inception as lead attorney in the areas of construction negligence, premises liability, legal malpractice, medical malpractice, and long-term care defense. Jordan represented insurance companies, hotels, restaurants, shopping centers, nightclubs, grocery stores, health clubs, general contractors, subcontractors, landlords, and tenants. He often achieved favorable outcomes in arbitrations, mediations, and settlement negotiations.

While in law school, Jordan served as a judicial intern to The Hon. Marvin E. Aspen, in the Northern District of Illinois. In that capacity he drafted opinions directed at the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title XII sexual harassment. Jordan also tried criminal cases as an intern for the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, Felony Trails Division. Jordan was also twice an editor of the Loyola International Law Review, and an oralist for the American Bar Association Moot Court Team.

Representative Case Highlights

• Jordan successfully tried to defense verdict a disputed liability automobile claim, in which the plaintiff alleged that the defendant illegally entered an intersection causing a significant collision. During the trial, Jordan argued that his client controlled the intersection, and that the plaintiff had entered the intersection illegally while running late to work. After barring the plaintiff's wage loss and permanency claims, Jordan impeached the plaintiff numerous times on the factual circumstance of the occurrence and persuaded the jury in his client's favor.

MEMBERSHIPS

American Bar Association
Chicago Bar Association
Decalogue Society of Lawyers
Illinois State Bar Association



- In a recent trial, Jordan tried to a defense verdict an automobile negligence claim where a significant collision occurred outside a large intersection. The plaintiff allegedly completed a turn before impact, and was struck by the defendant who alleged he controlled the rightof-way. At trial, Jordan's cross examination led to the plaintiff changing his story, and admitting he was likely at fault. The jury returned a verdict less than fifteen minutes after they began deliberations.
- Jordan obtained Summary Judgement on behalf of a national chain grocery store in a slip-and-fall case in Cook County, Illinois. Plaintiff alleged a fall on a foreign substance which had been dropped by another customer. With surveillance footage, Jordan argued that the sample had been dropped only 43 seconds before the fall occurred. As a result, the Court ruled that Defendant had neither actual or constructive notice of the substance, and thus, a duty to remediate had not arisen.
- In a premises liability case, Jordan defended an auto shop business against a slip-and-fall claim. The plaintiff allegedly incurred \$200,000+ in medical expenses when she sustained multiple injuries in a fall on the defendant's property due to an unnatural accumulation of ice and snow. As lead counsel, Jordan identified inconsistencies in the plaintiff's written statements immediately following the accident and disputed the extent of her injuries. The plaintiff requested \$869,000, and the jury returned a not-guilty verdict.
- In a matter involving a collision, Jordan successfully represented a garbage truck driver who struck the plaintiff's disabled vehicle after she had been involved in a separate accident only moments before. The plaintiff claimed the collision with the garbage truck caused a closed head injury, and aggravation of multiple pre-existing conditions. The defense argued that since the plaintiff was involved in two separate accidents, it was impossible to determine which of her injuries were caused by which accident. The defense also disputed the nature and extent of her injuries, as an MRI one week after the occurrence did not show a brain injury. The plaintiff requested \$1,500,000, and the jury returned a not-guilty verdict.
- Jordan successfully defended his clients in a legal malpractice action wherein the plaintiff alleged that the defendant attorney failed to properly settle a highly disputed workers' compensation action. Thereafter, the plaintiff alleged that the defendants fraudulently concealed negligence through a failure to communicate settlement offers and disperse funds aimed to compensate the plaintiff for future medical treatment. Jordan filed a Motion for Summary Judgement arguing that the plaintiff's claim mirrored an action previously dismissed by The United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois when the plaintiff previously failed to engage in the active prosecution of his claim. The action was dismissed with prejudice—as the defense established that the claim was barred by the doctrine of res judicata—putting an end to a dispute spanning five years, three

