Environmental Litigation



Regardless of the specific product or pollutant at issue, MG+M's litigators employ our talent, vision, teamwork, and fierce advocacy to achieve optimal results in the most cost-effective manner. MG+M attorneys are experienced in the efficient and effective defense of environmental litigation, including claims related to property damage, bodily injury, regulatory interpretation, and compliance in both established and emerging areas of concern, such as per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), including perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA). In addition, our attorneys prosecute, defend, and mediate environmental claims under the federal Superfund law and its Massachusetts counterpart, (Chapter 21E), the Clean Air Act, the Wetlands Protection Act, and several other environmental statutes and regulations.

A broad network of resources

Environmental matters can have significant financial ramifications for a business. MG+M's firm-wide emphasis on teamwork allows us to create multi-office teams of litigators with the particular skills needed to specifically address each environmental claim as effectively and efficiently as possible. Our attorneys constantly consult with our teams of experts and investigators to fully grasp the scope of environmental issues and work collaboratively to determine the most favorable approach for resolving litigation for each of our clients.

Substantive experience drives success

Even the simplest environmental problems require knowledge from many different disciplines. MG+M combines extensive trial experience with broad substantive experience in the constantly-changing arenas of federal, state, and local environmental law and regulation, in addition to the technical areas required to analyze and resolve environmental claims. Our lawyers have hands-on experience in environmental litigation ranging from pre-litigation legal and technical consultation through trials and appeals.

Experience

+ Obtained a dismissal for a wire manufacturing company against claims that its prior operations contributed to PFAS contamination of the water supply on Long Island, New York. Our initial investigation of historic corporate records revealed that the defendant did not have liability for the facility at issue. Moreover, the investigation revealed that the New York Department of Environmental Conservation had previously determined: (1) that PFAS on the property was not the result of the historic industrial operations on the property, but were instead the result of migration from other properties; (2) the public water supply is not affected by PFAS contamination of the property; and (3) the site does not pose a significant threat to public health or the environment. Based on the foregoing, plaintiff did not oppose our motion to dismiss.
+ Obtained a multimillion-dollar recovery for a utility company in a suit to recover response costs from a chemical manufacturer that had caused significant environmental contamination at the sites of several former manufactured-gas plants owned by the utility.
+ Successfully moved to dismiss a Massachusetts federal court class action suit in which plaintiffs alleged that waste delivered by the client contaminated their drinking water and soil with PFAS. The plaintiff class sought damages for the investigation and remediation of their drinking water wells and soil, the alleged diminution of their property value, and medical monitoring. Based on an aggressive investigation and product testing, we were able to demonstrate to the court that plaintiffs' allegations were insufficient to state a claim because they failed to plausibly allege that the waste at issue actually contained PFAS and, thus, the client's waste caused their injuries. The client's dismissal, at this early stage of the litigation, eliminated any liability risk and saved it a great deal of money in defense costs.
+ Resolved more than 70 environmental cleanup and indemnification claims on behalf of the purchaser of $4.4 billion in chemical plants located in 53 facilities worldwide. Served as trial counsel in the Southern District of New York for component of case concerning Clean Air Act claims that involved over $500 million in potential

damages.

+ Obtained $1.2 million arbitration judgment for a utility company in a dispute with a national university over the proper interpretation of a gas purchase agreement.
+ Represented one of the nation's largest retail developers in negotiations with the City of Boston to transfer the lease for Faneuil Hall Marketplace to a new developer.
+ Successfully argued for our client, a manufacturer of a septic system additive, that their product did not harm the environment. A state department of environmental protection banned the sale of the product, in spite of its approval of it 11 years earlier. Instead of relying solely on our discovery of the department's basis for its decision and the literature search we conducted, MG+M attorneys proactively commissioned a study on the environmental effects of the product when used as intended. The study confirmed that the product does not harm the environment when used as intended, and does not affect septic system function. The Court held that the department's decision to ban the product was arbitrary and capricious and not based on substantial evidence that the product harmed the environment. The department then agreed to allow the sale of the product in the state.
+ Represented a federal government contractor alleged to have caused over $100 million in damages by contaminating underground storage and pipelines previously utilized by the United States Strategic Petroleum Reserve program. The litigation lasted over seven years, and MG+M partners precisely timed a motion to sever the client's claims from the remainder just prior to trial, based on discovery deficiencies. The severance was granted and directly led to a dismissal of MG+M's client with no indemnity dollars paid.

Attorney Advertising. This material is for general informational purposes only and does not represent our advice as to any particular set of facts; nor does it represent any undertaking to keep recipients advised of all legal developments. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. © 2026 MG+M The Law Firm