



Harrisburg

2225 Sycamore Street
Mailbox # 625
Harrisburg PA 17111
D: 717.237.6958
F: 717.237.6949
lcsovelak@wglaw.com

Lucas Csovelak focuses his practice on defending employers, insurance companies, and third-party administrators in workers' compensation matters in central Pennsylvania.

Lucas represents a variety of clients, including multinational package delivery companies, retail corporations, healthcare facilities, and insurance carriers. He is involved in all aspects of litigation, utilization reviews, depositions, mediations, hearings, and testimonies.

Focused on managing risk and exposure, Lucas conducts a thorough review of claims to provide clients with strategies to achieve cost-effective results. He has been instrumental in obtaining favorable decisions for clients before workers' compensation judges, the Pennsylvania Workers' Compensation Appeal Board, and the Commonwealth Court.

Central Penn Business Journal recognized Lucas as one of "the most influential people in law" in 2021. Since 2020, Lucas has been included in the Pennsylvania edition of *Super Lawyers Magazine* as a "Rising Star," an honor given to the top 2.5 percent of attorneys in the Commonwealth who are 40 years old or younger, or in practice for 10 years or less. Super Lawyers lists are issued by Thomson Reuters. A description of the selection methodology can be found at <https://www.superlawyers.com/about/selection-process/>. In 2015, Lucas was named a "Select Lawyer" of Harrisburg by *Susquehanna Style Magazine* in workers' compensation law.

Experience

- ***Results may vary depending on your particular facts and legal circumstances.***
- Resolved a complex, high-exposure lumbar spine injury requiring multiple surgeries in an expeditious manner resulting

Assistant

Olivia Swihura
717.237.6940 ext. 2095
oswihura@wglaw.com

Industries

Staffing Companies, Employment
Agencies and PEOs
Manufacturing
Transportation
Retail
Healthcare

Practices

Workers' Compensation

Education

Widener University School of Law, J.D.,
cum laude, 2013
Muhlenberg College, B.S., 2010

Bar Admissions

Pennsylvania

in minimal litigation costs and a prompt stoppage of ongoing payments of indemnity and medical benefits. In doing so, it protected a subrogation lien valued at over \$400,000.00, which the client recently fully recovered.

- Successfully defended an employer in a matter where the employee was a paid firefighter and sustained an alleged work injury to his knee while running on an off premises track. Although the firefighter claimed that his position necessitated physical fitness, his superiors testified that no physical requirements were placed on firefighters and the employer did not conduct fitness testing. The employer argued the firefighter was outside the course and scope of his employment when he injured his knee. In his brief, the firefighter cited a case discussing a police officer who was granted benefits as a result of an injury that occurred when he was running off duty. The employer cited the same case, providing in depth analysis which distinguished the rule established by the Court. The employer highlighted the fact that the Court granted benefits in the police officer's case because the police department mandated physical fitness requirements and exercise furthered the interests of the police department. In the firefighter's case, physical fitness requirements were not mandated. The Workers' Compensation Judge agreed with the employer's argument and denied workers' compensation benefits.
- Received a favorable decision in a utilization review where the employer filed a review addressing the employee's opioid prescriptions and the provider under review failed to offer medical records to the utilization review organization. The review organization found that the treatment was not reasonable and necessary. The employee filed a petition to review the utilization review determination alleging that the organization did not make adequate efforts to obtain the medical records in question. Based on testimony of a representative of the review organization, the Workers' Compensation Judge found the opioid prescriptions were not reasonable and necessary because the provider failed to present medical records. The employer was not required to pay for any additional treatment.
- Obtained a favorable decision, wherein the WCJ reaffirmed that the employee was an independent contractor. Because the alleged employer did not carry workers' compensation insurance, the UEGF would have been liable for the employee's injuries. This case was originally won before the WCJ and appealed to the WCAB. The WCAB remanded the case to the WCJ to decide on the issue of "control."

Professional & Community Involvement

PA Chamber of Business and Industry, Workers Compensation
Committee Member

Harrisburg Chamber of Commerce, Member

Pennsylvania Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, Member

Capital Area Insurance Professionals