



Roa, Dominick

Position: Associate

Contact

Phone: (716) 402-5830

Fax: (646) 350-1901

Email: droa@gerberciano.com

Mailing Address

P.O. Box 1060, Buffalo, New York 14201

Location

Buffalo, New York

Practice Areas

- [Construction Law](#)
- [General Litigation](#)
- [Product Liability, Fire & Life Sciences](#)
- [Toxic Tort & Environmental](#)
- [Transportation Law](#)

Admissions

New York, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York; U.S. District Court for the Western District of New York; U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of New York



Biography

Dominick focuses his practice on defending property owners, general contractors, and businesses in complex personal injuries cases, including claims under New York's Labor Law. Dominick has extensive prior civil litigation experience, which includes representation of national companies in products liability and toxic tort matters, representation of medical professionals and hospitals against claims of medical malpractice, and representation of numerous entities against general negligence claims.

Prior to joining the firm, Dominick worked as an associate with a civil litigation firm specializing in general liability defense. He has litigated cases across New York State, both in Federal and State Court.

Dominick graduated from Buffalo State University with a bachelor's degree in criminal justice and a minor in Spanish. He received his law degree from the University of Buffalo School of Law.

Outside of work, Dominick enjoys spending time with his family, friends, and pets.

Education

- University at Buffalo School of Law, J.D., 2019
- Buffalo State University, B.S., 2016

Languages

- Spanish

Representative Matters

- Secured a complete summary judgment dismissal in the Supreme Court, Nassau County, eliminating a \$3 million exposure arising from an alleged slip-and-fall incident involving claimed spinal injuries. Through strategic discovery and deposition testimony, established that plaintiff did not observe any hazardous condition and that the area had been inspected shortly before the incident with no defect identified. The Court fully adopted these arguments and dismissed the complaint, all cross-claims, and the third-party action in their entirety.