



HARVEY KRUSE, P.C.
1050 Wilshire Drive, Suite 320
Troy, Michigan 48084
Office: (248) 649-7800
Fax: (248) 649-2316
E-Mail: kross@harveykruse.com

Katherine E. Ross

AREAS OF PRACTICE:

Civil Litigation
No Fault Insurance
Third Party Automobile Liability
Insurance Defense
Premises Liability
Appellate and Trial Practice
Subrogation

EDUCATION:

University of Detroit Mercy School of Law (J.D., *magna cum laude*, 2016)
Albion College (B.A. *with honors, cum laude*, 2010)

BAR ADMISSIONS:

State Bar of Michigan (2016)
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan (2018)
U.S. District Court for the Western District of Michigan (2019)
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (2020)

EMPLOYMENT:

Associate Attorney, Harvey Kruse, P.C. (2016-Present)
Law Clerk, Harvey Kruse, P.C. (2015-2016)

EXPERIENCE:

Prior to joining Harvey Kruse as an Associate Attorney in 2016, Ms. Ross worked as an extern in the Pre-Hearing Research Division of the Michigan Court of Appeals where she wrote bench briefs and proposed opinions for the Court. She also worked as a student attorney for the State Appellate Defender's Office clinic where she worked with indigent clients on their respective appeals. During law school she was an active member of both the Law Review and Moot Court. She competed on the New York City Bar Association's National Moot Court team.

With these experiences she honed her research and writing skills and gained insight into the appellate process in Michigan. Her practice focuses on first party no-fault claims, third-party automobile liability, premises liability, general negligence, subrogation, employment law, and appellate practice.

MEMBERSHIPS

Association of Defense Trial Counsel

HONORS AND AWARDS

Justice Frank Murphy Honor Society (2016)
New York City Bar Association National Moot Court team
Associate Director, Moot Court Board of Advocates
Symposium Director & Editor, University of Detroit Mercy
Law Review

REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS:

- ***Zichichi v Mull, et al***, unpublished per curiam opinion of the Court of Appeals, issued April 12, 2018 (Docket No. 337043) – affirming the trial court’s grant of summary disposition in favor of defendants on the basis that plaintiff did not sustain a serious impairment of body function. While the plaintiff did sustain a fractured collar bone as a result of the subject motor vehicle accident, it was argued, and affirmed by the court, that he could not establish that his general ability to lead his normal life was affected by the motor vehicle accident. The Michigan Supreme Court denied the plaintiff’s application for leave to appeal.
- ***Morgan v. Titan Indemnity Company***, Macomb County Circuit Court (2018) – summary disposition granted on plaintiff’s claim for no-fault benefits, specifically for two medical provider bills, where partial payment was already made on the claimed bills.
- ***Little v. Acuity Mutual Insurance Company, et al***, Macomb County Circuit Court (2018) – summary disposition as to plaintiff’s claim for no-fault benefits against defendant Acuity on the basis that Acuity was not the highest priority insurer for the subject motor vehicle accident. At the time of the accident, the plaintiff was not an employee of Acuity’s insured and therefore, MCL 500.3114(3) was inapplicable and plaintiff was bound by the general priority rule of MCL 500.3114(1).
- ***Estate of Conforti v Metro Controls, et al***, Macomb County Circuit Court (2019) – summary disposition in favor of defendants on plaintiff’s claims of automobile negligence and ownership liability stemming from a fatal pedestrian vs motor vehicle accident. Plaintiff’s decedent was crossing Van Dyke outside the crosswalk when he was struck by a vehicle. Summary disposition was granted on the basis that, as a matter of law, plaintiff’s decedent was more than 50% at fault for the accident.
- ***Franklin v. French Investments***, Wayne County Circuit Court (2019) – Ms. Ross obtained summary disposition on the basis of the open and obvious doctrine when the plaintiff was unable to establish that defendant had actual or constructive notice of the alleged dangerous condition, a slippery substance in the parking lot of defendant’s gas station.
- ***Bivins v. Special Multi-Services, Inc., et al***, Wayne County Circuit Court (2020) – summary disposition on plaintiff’s claims of false arrest, false imprisonment, assault and battery, negligence and vicarious liability stemming from an assault by a Detroit police officer working secondary employment. Our client provided a DPD officer to patrol the parking lot. This officer responded to the scene after the assault occurred. Summary disposition was obtained because at the time the second officer responded to the scene,

she was no longer within the course and scope of her secondary employment, but rather was acting as a Detroit Police Officer.

- ***Yelder v. Professional Transportation, Inc.***, Wayne County Circuit Court (2020) – summary disposition in favor of defendant as to the plaintiff’s claims of negligence and vicarious liability for the claims of assault and battery, kidnapping and false imprisonment against the defendant’s driver. This matter was decided without oral argument. In her briefing, Ms. Ross argued that there was no evidence to establish that the driver was negligent or acted in an unsafe manner, or that the transportation company knew or should have known of any dangerous propensities of the driver, which were not proven by the plaintiff.
- ***Alexander as next friend v. Madison Heights Glass, et al.***, Oakland County Circuit Court (2020) – Ms. Ross obtained summary disposition as to plaintiff’s claims of automobile negligence. Based on the facts presented, and arguments presented, the Court determined that the minor plaintiff could not establish a serious impairment of body function, specifically that she could not establish an objectively manifested impairment or that her ability to lead her life was affected, as required by MCL 500.3135.
- ***Pace v. OSC, Inc.***, Oakland County Circuit Court (2019) – After working on this matter since it was initiated, Ms. Ross was second chair at trial in this matter that resulted in a jury verdict of no cause of action as to plaintiff’s claim of automobile negligence in an admitted liability collision case. The jury that the rear-end collision was not the proximate cause of the plaintiff’s claimed injuries.