

# Outprepared. Every Time.

Three Pennsylvania PI Case Scenarios and What Happens  
When Attorneys Have the Record Mastered

## The Record Is the Case

---

In Pennsylvania PI litigation, the attorney who has the record mastered wins. The one who doesn't, loses – not on the law, not on the facts, but on preparation. The three scenarios below illustrate exactly what that difference looks like in practice, drawn from case types Pennsylvania firms handle every day.

---

### Case 1: The Defense Claims No Pre-Crash Pain

**Case type:** Auto accident, Philadelphia

**The challenge:** Defeating a causation defense in real time

A client is rear-ended on I-76 near the Vine Street Expressway. The defense sends a retained expert to argue that the client had no documented neck or shoulder complaints before the crash and that all treatment is post-incident. This is the most common defense tactic in Pennsylvania auto cases – find a gap, manufacture a narrative, and put plaintiff's counsel on the defensive before the first mediation session begins.

**Without Supio:** The attorney knows pre-crash treatment exists but locating it precisely across hundreds of pages from multiple providers, in the middle of a deposition, is not realistic. The defense position lands.

**With Supio:** The attorney opens the AI Assistant and asks: "Show me all documented complaints of neck and shoulder pain before [crash date], with Bates-stamped page numbers." In seconds: 14 entries, with dates, providers, exact quotes, and citations across four treatment records spanning two years.

---

This is exactly what happened at Travis Legal Offices when a defense expert claimed no pre-crash neck pain existed.

*"It made me look like I had every page of the record memorized. It went right past defense counsel and straight to the people who write the checks."* – Todd Travis, Travis Legal Offices [1]

**The result:** A \$700,000 offer settled for \$3 million. [1]

Under Paul Miller's Law, distracted driving cases now carry a statutory negligence component that raises the stakes at exactly these moments. The attorney who can cite 14 records in real time wins. The one who cannot loses on a matter of preparation.

---

## Case 2: The Certificate of Merit Deadline Is Tuesday

**Case type:** Medical malpractice, Pittsburgh

**The challenge:** Processing records fast enough to meet a tightening deadline

A client undergoes surgery at a Pittsburgh hospital. The family believes the surgical team deviated from the standard of care. A Pennsylvania-licensed expert has agreed to review the case, but the records are 1,400 pages across three providers, and the expert needs a complete, organized chronology before the certificate of merit deadline.

Under proposed HB 2088, these deadlines would tighten further. Even under current law, this scenario plays out in Pennsylvania med-mal practices every week.

**Without Supio:** A paralegal begins working through the records Monday morning. By Tuesday she is on page 400. The chronology is incomplete. The expert cannot certify. The filing deadline passes.

**With Supio:** The records are uploaded Monday morning. By afternoon, Supio has generated a complete, source-linked chronology – every diagnosis, surgical note, specialist consultation, and outcome entry organized by date and provider, each cited to its exact source page. The expert receives it the same day, completes her review, and the certificate of merit is filed on time.

*"Our bellwether case selection process now takes less than a week versus one to two months previously. This acceleration is transformative."* – Paul Miller, Partner, Howie Sacks & Henry [2]

**The result:** The case is filed. The client has her day in court.

---

## Case 3: A Defense IME Threatens a \$740,000 Case

**Case type:** Catastrophic injury, I-80 trucking collision

**The challenge:** Rebutting a defense IME before mediation

A client suffers a traumatic brain injury in a tractor-trailer collision on I-80. The defense responds with a detailed IME report claiming the injuries are pre-existing and causation is disputed. The carrier drops its offer to \$100,000. Mediation is in three days.

**Without Supio:** Rebutting a detailed IME manually takes days. The treating physicians cannot complete their review in time. The attorney goes into mediation on the back foot.

**With Supio:** The IME report is uploaded immediately. The attorney asks the AI Assistant to identify records the defense examiner did not review and claims contradicted by the treatment record. The output is precise, cited, and complete. The treating physicians receive a targeted rebuttal brief within hours.

*"Supio gave our experts the ammo they needed. That rebuttal crushed their causation theory."* – Todd Travis, Travis Legal Offices [1]

**The result:** The \$100,000 defense offer settled for **\$740,000**. [1]

Under proposed SB 578, stacking reform could cap recovery at a fraction of what stacked coverage currently allows. When the ceiling is lower, your ability to reach it depends entirely on the quality of your evidence.

## The Pattern Holds at Every Scale

---

These three cases reflect a consistent pattern across more than 100,000 cases processed and over \$1 billion in settlements facilitated on the Supio platform.

The most significant single outcome: TorHoerman Law's trial against Abbott Laboratories, where Supio processed 43,000+ pages of NICU medical records and 600+ hours of deposition testimony.

*"We're not just reacting to the other side's arguments. We're building proactive, nuanced positions because we can access the data faster."* – Tyler Schneider, Managing Partner, TorHoerman Law [3]

---

**The result:** a \$495 million jury verdict. [4]

From a \$740,000 TBI settlement to a nine-figure verdict, the principle is the same: the attorney who has the record mastered wins.

## Try It on a Real Case

Supio offers a free trial using an actual case from your docket. Most firms are convinced within two weeks, not because of the technology, but because of what they find in records they thought they already understood.

[supio.com](https://supio.com) | [Book a demo today](#)

---

[1] Travis Legal Offices – Supio Customer Story [2] Howie Sacks & Henry – Supio Customer Story [3] TorHoerman Law – LawNext Podcast [4] TorHoerman Law – Supio Customer Story (\$495M verdict) [5] Paul Miller's Law, Act 10 of 2024 [6] SB 578, Pennsylvania General Assembly [7] HB 2088, Pennsylvania General Assembly