



## Jessica N. Gallinaro

Associate



202.719.4189  
jgallinaro@wiley.law



Jessica counsels insurers in connection with coverage issues and disputes arising under professional liability insurance policies.

### Representative Matters

- Represents insurers in coverage litigation before state and federal courts around the country.
- Advises insurers on a variety of coverage issues in connection with professional liability and cyber policies, such as the applicability of policy exclusions and conditions.
- Conducts legal research addressing a wide variety of procedural and substantive issues for clients involved in complex insurance litigation.
- Serves as monitoring counsel in connection with ongoing litigation matters in federal and state courts.

### Professional Experience

- Obtained summary judgment in Texas state court in favor of insurer that no coverage was available for Wells notices issued and an enforcement action brought by the SEC because they were related to the SEC's original investigation, which commenced prior to the claims-made policy period. *UniPixel, Inc. v. XL Specialty Ins. Co.*, Cause No. 2016-70515 (Tex. Dist. Ct., Harris Cnty. Aug. 23, 2018).
- Obtained summary judgment in North Carolina federal district court in favor of insurer that it owed no coverage for two underlying lawsuits because the insured failed to provide

### Practice Areas

Insurance  
Litigation

### Credentials

#### Education

J.D., *magna cum laude*, George Mason University School of Law  
B.A., *summa cum laude*, The College of William and Mary

#### Law Journals

Articles Editor, *George Mason Law Review*

#### Bar and Court Memberships

District of Columbia Bar  
Virginia Bar

#### Certifications

Legal Lean Sigma Institute (LLSI) White Belt

notice of the EEOC charges of discrimination that arose from the same facts at issue in the underlying lawsuits. *John Hiester Chrysler Jeep, LLC v. Greenwich Ins. Co.*, 2017 WL 6210897 (E.D.N.C. Dec. 8, 2017).

- Obtained summary judgment in New Jersey federal district court in favor of excess insurer that it had no duty to defend an insured hospital because, although the insured had provided notice of circumstances that might lead to a claim, it had failed to notify the excess insurer of the actual claim or a subsequent settlement offer. *Kennedy Univ. Hosp. v. Darwin Nat'l Assurance Co.*, No. 16-2494 (RBK/JS), 2017 WL 1352208 (D.N.J. Apr. 7, 2017).