IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

McHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PAUL DULBERG, )

 )

 Plaintiff, )

 )

v. ) Case No. 17 LA 377

 )

THE LAW OFFICE OF THOMAS J. )

POPOVICH, P.C. and HANS MAST, )

 )

 Defendants. )

**DULBERG’S ANSWERS TO DEFENDANT HANS MAST’S**

**INTERROGATORIESTO PLAINTIFF PAUL DULBERG**

Paul Dulberg, by and through his attorneys, The Clinton Law Firm, LLC, pursuant to the provisions of Illinois Supreme Court Rule 213, responds to Defendant Hans Mast’s Interrogatories To Plaintiff Paul Dulberg as follows:

# INTERROGATORIES

1. Identify and describe each and every way that Popovich or Mast breached any duty of care to you, the date of the breach, and when and how you became aware of the breach.

 **ANSWER:**

 Between October 2013 and January 2014, Mast advised Dulberg that Illinois law does not permit a recovery against the McGuires’ in the circumstances of Dulberg’s case and that he would not receive any recovery from the McGuires. Mast advised Dulberg that the judge would likely rule in favor of the McGuires on a motion for summary judgment.

Mast further advised that Dulberg would retain his claim against Gaganon and be able to seek and receive a full recovery from Gagnon.

1. Identify the date and location of any discussion between you and Mast in which Mast represented to you that there was no possibility of any liability against William or Caroline McGuire and/or Auto Owners Insurance Company, and identify what you said to Mast, and what he said to you.

 **ANSWER:**

 Various dates between October 2013 to January 2014. The advice was provided via email, text messages, and in person meetings.

 Between October 2013 and January 2014, Mast advised Dulberg that Illinois law does not permit a recovery against the McGuires’ in the circumstances of Dulberg’s case and that he would not receive any recovery from the McGuires. Mast advised Dulberg that the judge would likely rule in favor of the McGuires on a motion for summary judgment.

Mast further advised that Dulberg would retain his claim against Gaganon and be able to seek and receive a full recovery from Gagnon.

 All documents in Plaintiff’s possession and control produced.

1. Identify the other property owned by the McGuire’s as alleged in paragraph 50 of your Second Amended Complaint.

 **ANSWER:**

 The McGuire’s owned their home and vehicles. McGuire’s also held bank accounts in their name. Investigation continues.

1. When did you or your attorneys (following the withdrawal by Popovich and Mast) first learn that the McGuire’s had an insurance policy that potentially would have covered the claim for an amount greater than $100,000?

 **ANSWER:**

 The McGuire’s produced insurance information to Dulberg on the day of the accident and also were represented by insurance counsel.

 Respectfully submitted,

#

#  /s/ Julia C. Williams

#  Julia C. Williams

#  One of Plaintiff’s Attorneys

# Edward X. Clinton, Jr.

# Julia C. Williams

# The Clinton Law Firm, LLC

# 111 W Washington Street

# Suite 1437

# Chicago, IL 60602

# Attorneys for Plaintiff, Atty No. 35893

# 312.357.1515

# ed@clintonlaw.net

# juliawilliams@clintonlaw.net