


VIRGINIA LAWYERS WEEKLY

Vol. 22, No. 32

January 14, 2008

www.valawyersweekly.com

NN judge approves \$9.25M asbestos verdict



HATTEN

A Newport News judge has affirmed a \$9.25 million jury verdict returned for the executor for the estate of a former Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock machinist who died in 2006 from mesothelioma.

The case of *Oney v. John Crane Inc.* is similar to *John Crane Inc. v. Jones*, in which another Newport News Circuit Court jury awarded \$10.4 million to the administrator of the estate of a man who installed asbestos packing and gaskets in the engine rooms of ships in the 1960s.

The Supreme Court of Virginia heard arguments last week in *Jones*, Record No. 062164, and is expected to issue an opinion in September.

The two cases were tried under maritime law with other asbestos manufacturers as defendants. The jury was asked to apportion the liability of the manufacturers and concluded

in *Oney* that John Crane's responsibility was 60 percent and Garlock Sealing Technology's was 40 percent.

John Crane was found to be 34 percent liable in *Jones*.

Robert R. Hatten, the attorney for both estates, had settled claims against Garlock in that

case and a third defendant was insolvent, so the total recovery from John Crane in that case would be about \$3.5 million.

Oney was tried in April and Circuit Judge Timothy S. Fisher rejected John Crane's post-trial motions on May 25.

VIRGINIA'S LARGEST VERDICTS OF 2007

WRONGFUL DEATH

#5 \$9.25 million

Oney, Executor v. John Crane Inc.

Type of Case: Wrongful death, mesothelioma

Court: Newport News Circuit Court

Attorney: Robert R. Hatten, Newport News

Summary: A former Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock machinist died in 2006 from mesothelioma. He was exposed to asbestos, the only cause for the disease, while installing asbestos packing and gaskets in the engine rooms of ships in the 1960s.

The case was tried under maritime law with other asbestos manufacturers as defendants, and the jury concluded that John Crane Inc. was 60 percent responsible and Garlock Sealing Technology was 40 percent responsible. Hatten had settled earlier with Garlock, leaving a judgment against John Crane of about \$5.55 million.

The Supreme Court of Virginia refused John Crane's petition for appeal last month. Last year, the court affirmed a judgment for another of Hatten's clients against John Crane in a similar case, *Jones v. John Crane Inc.* (VLW 007-6-113)