



Jeffrey G. Schultz

Senior Attorney

28411 Northwestern Highway
Suite 500
Southfield, MI 48034
T: 248.785.4723
jschultz@fosterswift.com

Jeffrey Schultz is a senior attorney and a member of Foster Swift's litigation practice in the firm's Southfield office where he concentrates his practice on personal injury and insurance defense matters. He has experience in a variety of civil defense fields including construction litigation, first and third-party auto liability, workers' compensation defense, and premises liability.

Handling all aspects of litigation, including initial pleadings, written discovery, document production (including e-discovery), depositions, court appearances, motion practice, trial preparation, and appellate practice. Jeff has been involved in cases in various practice areas, including personal injury, insurance coverage and subrogation, employment law, and business disputes.

Jeff received his juris doctorate from Wayne State University Law School, graduating *cum laude* and in the Order of the Coif, which is awarded for being in the Top 10 percent of the class. During his last semester of law school, he also worked with non-profits and social enterprises as a Student Attorney in Wayne Law's Clinical Program.

Jeff is passionate about the law and assisting firm clients in getting the best results possible. His legal hero is Thurgood Marshall. When not practicing law, he enjoys music (especially Bob Dylan) and reruns of "Law and Order."

PRACTICE AREAS

Appellate Practice
Construction Law
Employment Law
Insurance Defense
No-Fault Litigation
Transportation Law

EDUCATION

Wayne State University Law School,
J.D., *cum laude*, Order of the Coif,
2018

University of Michigan – Dearborn,
B.A., with distinction, 2015

BAR AND COURT ADMISSIONS

Michigan

U.S. District Court for the Eastern
District of Michigan

U.S. District Court for the Western
District of Michigan

HONORS & RECOGNITIONS

Best Lawyers "One to Watch,"
Insurance Law, Litigation – Labor
and Employment, Personal Injury
Litigation – Defendants, 2024-2025

Dbusiness "Top Lawyers", 2025

Michigan Super Lawyers "Rising
Star", 2024

Wayne State University Law School,
Order of The Coif



REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

- *Earlene Love v. Ashton Masar*, Genesee County Circuit Court (2022). Assisted in obtaining summary disposition in an automobile negligence lawsuit filed against our client. Successfully argued to the Court that the plaintiff had failed to establish an objective manifestation of an impairment or a change in her pre-accident lifestyle. Demonstrated to the Court that the plaintiff's alleged injuries could not be differentiated from her pre-existing chronic conditions.
- *Joyce Battle, Joshua Harrington, and Tomas Lopez v. Raid Arabo, et al.*, Wayne County Circuit Court (2021). Assisted in obtaining summary disposition as to all three plaintiffs in an auto negligence lawsuit. Filed three Motions for Summary Disposition, asserting that none of the plaintiffs were able to establish threshold injuries under the no-fault act. The Court concurred, agreeing that the plaintiffs' alleged MRI findings could not be connected with the accident and that the plaintiffs had not demonstrated changes in their lifestyles. The Court granted all three motions, and our client was dismissed from the case.
- *Corbin, a minor v. Milford Casualty Ins. Comp., et al.; and Allwood, a minor, v Milford Casualty Ins. Comp., et al.*, Washtenaw County Circuit Court (2021). In two companion cases, obtained summary disposition on the basis that our client was not in the order of priority, and that the MACP-assigned insurer was responsible for the accident. Successfully established that our client's insured, a car dealership, was not the owner of the subject vehicle at time of the accident, despite allegations of a defective title transfer. Both minor plaintiffs were catastrophically injured.
- *Memberselect Ins. Comp. v Brandon Droelle, et al.*, Macomb County Circuit Court (2021). Assisted in obtaining summary disposition in a declaratory action brought by insurer. It was undisputed that the driver had been delivering food within the scope of his employment at the time of the subject accident. However, we successfully argued that an exception to the business-use exclusion within the plaintiff's policy applied, making the plaintiff the highest priority insurer.

Wayne State University Law School,
Wayne State Law Review, Note and
Comment Editor



- *Lashawnda Davis v. George Perez, et al.*, Wayne County Circuit Court (2021). Assisted in obtaining summary disposition in an automobile negligence case, with the Court agreeing that Plaintiff's nonspecific MRI findings were insufficient to constitute an objective manifestation of any alleged impairment, and that Plaintiff's testimony failed to establish that her alleged injuries had affected her ability to lead her pre-accident lifestyle. Plaintiff's lawsuit was dismissed with prejudice.
- *Aaron Martenies and Faith Martenies v. Noah Blyski, et al.*, Livingston County Circuit Court (2021). Assisted in obtaining summary disposition in an automobile negligence case on two grounds: first, that prior releases of claims signed by Plaintiffs and the defendant driver were effective to extinguish vicarious liability as to our clients, despite not being named in the agreement; and second, that Plaintiffs had failed to show our clients had committed any independent torts, namely negligent hiring, retention, or supervision. The Court dismissed Plaintiffs' claims with prejudice.
- *Anthony Johnson v. John Baker, et al.*, Wayne County Circuit Court (2020). Assisted in obtaining summary disposition on the basis that the plaintiff had not suffered a threshold injury under the no-fault act, as the result of a pedestrian vs. motor vehicle accident. The Court found that the plaintiff could not show he had an impairment that someone other than himself would observe or perceive as impairing an important body function, and dismissed Plaintiff's claims with prejudice.
- *Gerald Sutton, et al. v Wesco Insurance Company, et al.*, Wayne County Circuit Court (2020). Assisted in obtaining the dismissal of four intervening medical providers with claims of over \$450,000. We argued that the intervening providers' failure to file a complaint after being granted leave to do so meant that the intervention had been invalid. Further, we reasoned that pursuant to the no-fault act, any future attempts to recover the medical expenses were barred by the one-year back rule. The Court agreed and vacated the Order Granting Intervention, removing the four proposed Intervening Plaintiffs and their claims from the lawsuit.
- *Autrice Warrior v. The Estate of Jean Wolford, et al.*, Genessee County Circuit Court (2019). Assisted in obtaining summary disposition on the basis that defendant driver was not covered under his mother's insurance policy. Our arguments were based on policy language which excluded coverage where the driver did not have a "reasonable belief" they were entitled to use the insured vehicle. At time of litigation, both defendant driver and defendant owner, the driver's mother, were deceased, and the motion depended upon admitting prior recorded statements for unavailable witnesses through hearsay exceptions in the Michigan Rules of Evidence. The Court held that our client had no duty to defend or indemnify the insureds in the litigation.
- *Alfredo Garcia v. Atsalis Brothers Painting Co. and Z Contractors, Inc.*, Lapeer County Circuit Court (2019). Assisted in obtaining summary disposition as to both defendants. Plaintiff was seriously injured while leaving a construction worksite for lunch, and he sought to recover from both his direct employer and the general contractor of the project. We argued, and the Court agreed, that worker's compensation was the plaintiff's sole remedy against his employer, and that the general contractor was not liable under the common work area doctrine.



- *Centria Home Rehabilitation v. Nationwide Insurance Company*, Oakland County Circuit Court (2018). Obtained an order requiring medical provider to disclose information regarding the services it provided outside of the no-fault act. Attendant care agency maintained two separate entities: one providing services to individuals involved in auto accidents, and a second which served all other patients. The plaintiff argued that the practices of the separate entity were not relevant to the litigation; we argued that they were relevant to determining the provider's "customary charges". The Court agreed, compelling discovery on the issue.