



## John "Skip" M. Kunst, Jr.

Of Counsel  
[skip.kunst@dinsmore.com](mailto:skip.kunst@dinsmore.com)

Cincinnati, OH  
Tel: (513) 977-8214

Skip has 40 years of litigation experience, primarily defending Fortune 50 companies in the automotive and consumer products industries.

### Services

- Litigation
- Class Action
- Appellate
- Product Liability
- Mass Tort
- Tort
- Toxic Tort
- Transportation Industry
- Insurance Industry

### Education

- University of Cincinnati College of Law (J.D., 1966)
- Wittenberg University (B.A., 1963)
  - Economics

### Bar Admissions

- Ohio (inactive)

### Court Admissions

- U.S. Supreme Court
- U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

- U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio
- U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio

## **Affiliations/Memberships**

- Ohio State Bar Association
- Cincinnati Bar Association
- Product Liability Advisory Council (1990 - present)
- Wittenberg University, Board of Directors (1992 - 2004)
- Cincinnati Area Chapter of the American Red Cross (1977 - 1990)
  - Disaster Services Committee, chair
  - Board member
- Anderson Township, Board of Park Commissioners (1984 - 1996)
- Cincinnati Bankers Club, board member (1990 - 1996)

## **Distinctions**

- Peer Review Rated AV in *Martindale-Hubbell*

## **Experience**

### **Amway v. Procter & Gamble**

We defended our client against a claim in excess of \$100 million for alleged defamation and tortious interference. The case resulted in summary judgment for the defense.

### **Bond v. General Motors**

We represented Defendant General Motors in a suit filed by its employee under the Employee's Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 1001 et seq., alleging breach of fiduciary obligations and equitable or promissory estoppel. The U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio granted summary judgement for the employer.

### **Lykins v. GMC**

Dinsmore & Shohl represented General Motors Corporation in a suit filed by the surviving spouse of one of its employees seeking in excess of \$300,000 in benefits under the deceased husband's employee pension plan. The district court ruled, as a matter of law, that Plaintiff was not entitled to receive surviving spouse benefits under her deceased husband's ERISA-qualified employee pension plan, because her husband had not changed the designation of his former wife as beneficiary under the GMC plan prior to his death. The case was dismissed upon Motion for Summary Judgment.

### **Personal Injury Case Related to a Vehicle Seatbelt**

We represented a major automobile manufacturer in a personal injury product liability lawsuit. The Plaintiff alleged that her seatbelt failed to restrain her during an accident, and she contended that she suffered severe head injuries resulting in alleged cognitive impairment. By effective presentation of our expert witnesses, and through extensive discovery, we were able to negotiate favorable settlement terms to resolve the litigation.