

Ronald L. Raider

Partner

1100 Peachtree Street NE
Suite 2800 , Atlanta , GA USA 30309
t 404.532.6909 | f 404.541.3354
rraider@kilpatricktownsend.com

Services

Alternative Dispute Resolution
Complex Commercial Litigation
Environment & Product Regulation
Litigation
Product Liability
Trade Secrets

Industries

Technology



Ron Raider concentrates his practice on complex civil litigation, technology litigation, international arbitrations, and environmental litigation. He has represented clients in litigation matters pertaining to copyright infringement, licensing and development agreements, federal and state tort actions, class actions, deceptive trade practices, and consumer products matters. He has defended several corporate clients in patent infringement litigation, and negotiated several federal and Clean Water Act enforcement consent decrees. He joined the firm in 1990 and was elected to partnership in 1995. He is AV[®] rated by Martindale-Hubbell.*

* CV, BV, and AV are registered certification marks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used in accordance with the Martindale-Hubbell certification procedure's standards and policies.

Experience

Arbitration

Represented a Consortium of Engineering and Construction Companies in disputes involving the construction of a hydropower electrical generating facility in an International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) arbitration. The matter resolved favorably before the final hearings.

Represented a toy company licensor in a dispute with a former licensee administered by the International Institution for Conflict Prevention and Resolution (CPR). The matter resulted in a favorable arbitration award.

Represented an international engineering company in a trade secret arbitration before the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (ICDR). The matter resolved favorable before the final hearings.



The firm served as lead counsel representing an international telecommunications provider in an investment arbitration before three distinguished international arbitrators, alleging billions in damages in connection with the alleged right to exercise a stock put. The matter resolved favorably after phase one of the arbitral hearings in Miami, Florida and Washington, D.C.

Represented a *Fortune* 500 company in a dispute with a joint venture partner in Mexico relative to the client's right to transfer its interests in an equity affiliate as part of the sale of its textile assets.

Represented a *Fortune* 500 company in a dispute with a joint venture partner in Japan relative to the client's right to transfer its interests in an equity affiliate as part of the sale of its textile assets.

Represented a *Fortune* 500 company in an international arbitration administered by the ICC involving a longstanding contract with a partner relative to the commercial development of a pesticide. A tribunal was selected and the parties presented written statements to the Tribunal. The parties reached a negotiated resolution.

Commercial Litigation

Represented the creditors' committee and then plan trustee for Vesta Insurance Group Inc. in connection with its liquidation. The firm assisted with reaching a complex multimillion dollar claim settlement with the Texas Insurance Commissioner. The plan trustee obtained a multimillion dollar settlement of a lawsuit handled by the firm against former officers for breach of fiduciary duties. *In re Vesta Insurance Group, Inc.*, Case No. 06-02517 (Bankr. N.D. Ala. filed July 18, 2006).

Represented a telecommunications company in an antitrust case which raised issues under essential facilities doctrine and the intersection of antitrust law and the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. The United States Supreme Court ultimately decided the antitrust liability issues in a companion case in our client's favor. *Verizon Comm'ns Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP*, 540 US 398 (2004).

The firm served as lead counsel on behalf of Chrysler Group and Mercedes-Benz USA LLC in connection with a string of successes in the United States District Court, Western District of Wisconsin and the United States District Court, Eastern District of Texas against related entities Orion, Taurus, and ST Sales Tech. The plaintiff entities, who had asserted several patents against Chrysler and Mercedes after a settlement agreement was in place, were put on the defensive when we asserted counterclaims for breach of a previous settlement agreement. The United States District Court, Western District of Wisconsin granted summary judgment for Chrysler and MBUSA finding non-infringement, invalidity, and dismissing all the patent-related claims. Later a jury returned a verdict on liability in favor of Chrysler and MBUSA on the breach of contract claims. After a finding that the plaintiff had not acted in good faith, the court then awarded contract damages and legal fees. Related



suits were later dismissed. The Federal Circuit affirmed the finding of no liability and the award of attorney fees to our client. (Judge Crabb and Judge Davis). *Taurus IP, LLC v. Chrysler, LLC and Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC*, No. 07-0158 (W.D. Wis. filed Mar. 20, 2007); *Orion IP, LLC v. DaimlerChrysler* (E.D. Tex.) and *Orion IP, LLC v. MBUSA* (E.D. Tex.).

Represented a *Fortune 500* company in a "settlement fraud" case alleging federal RICO, fraud, and other state law claims arising out of our client's alleged fraudulent inducement of hundreds of settlements of product liability claims in the early 1990s. Between 1996 and 2000, approximately 70 plaintiffs asserted "settlement fraud" claims against our client in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or in Hawaii state court, and the company asserted claims in federal court for breach of the settlement agreement. Ultimately, all of the federal cases were consolidated under the *Matsuura* case style. Our client originally prevailed in the district court on motions to dismiss the "settlement fraud" claims based on provisions in the settlement agreements. When those rulings were superseded by a ruling of the Delaware Supreme Court, motions for judgment were filed on the pleadings which led to a certified question proceeding before the Hawaii Supreme Court. After the Hawaii Supreme Court ruled, the District Court granted a number of dispositive motions filed by our client, as did the Hawaii state court in a related case. During the pendency of appeals from those decisions, the vast majority of the Hawaii claimants settled. Similar dispositions results in Florida and Georgia litigations.

Environmental Litigation

The firm served as lead counsel in representing the city of Pueblo, Colorado in a successful challenge to parts of an EPA rule on sludge handling requirements and biosolids regulations for selenium. *Leather Indus., et al. v. EPA*, 40 F.3d 393 (D.C. Cir. 1994).

The firm served as lead counsel to City of Atlanta regarding National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permitting and enforcement issues for the City's water reclamation centers and combined sewer overflow facilities and the related collection and transmission system. Representation also included negotiating a federal Consent Decree with the Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Justice, and the State of Georgia to settle a citizen suit filed by a citizen activist group. Recently was allowed by the federal district court to join extraterritorial users of the City's water system to the pending Consent Decree matter when the City was faced with a taking of the City's water assets. All disputes regarding service area and assets will now be resolved under the jurisdiction of the federal court, rather than the state court.

Assisted a Specially Appointed Attorney General to represent the Georgia Ports Authority in claims challenging the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project.

Education

George Washington University, J.D. (1985) *with honors*



State University of New York, University at Albany, B.A. (1982)

Admissions

New York (1986)

District of Columbia (1988)

Georgia (2003)

Court Admissions

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia

U.S. Court of Federal Claims

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

Insights

[Alerts](#)

The Future of FFCRA: 2021 Brings a Shift from Mandatory to Voluntary Leave through March
December 29, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Broad Moratorium on Residential Evictions Issued by the CDC Faces Judicial Challenge
September 21, 2020

[Alerts](#)

COVID-19 Chart of State Immunity Statutes
July 30, 2020

[Alerts](#)

COVID-19: School Reopening Jujitsu For Employers
July 27, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Masks and COVID-19: Statewide Requirements and Recommendations
July 14, 2020

[Alerts](#)

COVID-19 Reopening Issues: Taking Advantage of the State Immunities Whether or Not Your State Has Enacted COVID-19 Immunities Legislation

July 9, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Georgia Legislature Passes Broad COVID-19 Immunities Legislation

June 29, 2020

[Alerts](#)

The Philadelphia Commerce Court Establishes a Temporary Financial Monitor Program

June 24, 2020

[Webinars](#)

Reopening Guidelines for Retailers

May 14, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Force Majeure Defenses Under Illinois Law

May 4, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Contract Defenses Under Washington Law

May 4, 2020

[Alerts](#)

COVID-19: Re-Opening Issues Checklist

April 27, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Force Majeure Defenses Under Florida Law

April 22, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Force Majeure Defenses Under Colorado Law

April 22, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Force Majeure Defenses Under California Law

April 22, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Force Majeure Defenses Under Delaware Law

April 17, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Force Majeure Defenses Under New York Law

April 15, 2020

[Alerts](#)

CARES Act | Small Business Loan Programs under the CARES Act: Look Here First for Financing

March 26, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Checklist for Evaluating the Applicability of State and Local Shelter in Place Orders

March 25, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Practical Considerations for Manufacturers Pivoting to PPE Production to Combat COVID-19 Pandemic

March 25, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Cutting Through the Fog: How to Navigate Federal, State, and Local Orders and Guidance to Determine Whether Your Business Must Cease In-Person Operations Due to COVID-19

March 23, 2020

[Alerts](#)

Excused Non-Performance-Governments Order Construction to Halt Amid COVID-19 Outbreak

March 18, 2020

[Alerts](#)

COVID-19: Contract Defenses

March 17, 2020



[Alerts](#)

Keep Your Eye on Biometrics: Illinois High Court Waves Six Flags at Spokeo

February 12, 2019

[News Releases](#)

Kilpatrick Townsend Launches KT Class Action Blog

January 19, 2017

[In The News](#)

Kilpatrick Townsend's Media Report December 19, 2014 - January 8, 2015

January 9, 2015