



Martha Ravenhill, Counsel

Direct: 314.584.4570

Email: martha@caclawfirm.com

Admissions

- Missouri
- Illinois
- U.S. District Court for Eastern Missouri
- U.S. District Court for Western Missouri Bankruptcy Court
- U.S. District Court for Southern Illinois
- U.S. District Court for Central Illinois
- U.S. District Court for Nebraska
- U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

Practice Areas

- Civil Defense Litigation
- Automotive Liability
- Insurance Coverage
- Premises Liability
- Construction Defect
- Appellate
- Commercial Litigation

Martha advises and defends individual and corporate clients in litigation involving personal injury, automobile liability, premises liability, trucking liability, catastrophic loss, professional liability, insurance coverage disputes, and intentional torts. She has represented clients in all aspects of civil litigation, from initiating lawsuits to resolving claims and securing favorable verdicts or outcomes in alternative dispute resolution proceedings, including mediations, arbitrations, and settlement negotiations.

Prior to joining Childress Ahlheim Cary LLC, Martha practiced general civil liability defense litigation at Missouri and Illinois law firms and served as an Assistant Attorney General in the Missouri Attorney General's Office. In these roles, she gained valuable experience representing clients in state and federal courts in complex civil litigation cases, special prosecutions in circuit courts throughout the state, and in several state and federal habeas corpus proceedings. She has successfully written and argued several dispositive motions, earning dismissals of the claims against her clients, tried jury and bench trials, and successfully argued before the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Before law school, Martha worked in government affairs for a clean water non-profit and as an account executive for an international public affairs firm specializing in high-regulation industries.

Martha was honored to be named as a "Rising Star" in 2021 by Illinois Super Lawyers and as an "Emerging Lawyer" by Leading Lawyers in 2023.

A fifth-generation attorney from a small town in Mid-Missouri, Martha's familial background of solo and small practice attorneys, instilled in her a respect for the practice of law and an appreciation of caring for each client. She endeavors to be as accessible and dedicated to each of her clients as she would be if they were a neighbor from her hometown. Outside the office, Martha enjoys traveling, eating new cuisines but not cooking them, and spending time with her friends and family.



Education

- J.D., DePaul University College of Law
- B.A., Columbia College, cum laude, History

Recognitions

- Illinois Super Lawyers Rising Stars – 2021
- Emerging Lawyers – 2023

Reported Cases

- **Wright v. Bowersox** 720 F.3d 979 (8th Cir. 2013). Court properly denied a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas corpus petition because a state court's conclusion that petitioner was competent to stand trial and represent himself was correct.
- **State ex rel. Koster v. Suter** 447 S.W.3d 673 (Mo.App. 2014). The Missouri Appellate Court issued a writ of prohibition finding that there was insufficient evidence to support habeas relief and that the circuit court's dismissal of the sexually violent predator petition was erroneous.
- **State ex rel. Koster v. Fitzsimmons** 425 S.W.3d 166 (Mo.App. 2014). The Missouri Appellate Court ruled that the circuit court exceeded its authority in granting writ of habeas corpus because detainee failed to show a prior circuit court lacked jurisdiction in prior case to order that he be taken into custody because order of dismissal was not final judgment as it failed to comply with Mo. Sup. Ct. R. 74.01(a).
- **Miller v. Missouri Dept. of Corrections** 436 S.W.3d 692 (Mo.App. 2014). The Missouri Appellate Court held that a prisoner was not guaranteed release on parole because the Missouri statutes do not create any liberty interests in parole.
- **Little v. McSwain** 400 S.W.3d 461 (Mo.App. 2013). Parolee's argument in a motion for summary judgment, which was denied, that Mo. Rev. Stat. § 217.690.3 was retrospective and violated the ex post facto clause of the U.S. and Missouri Constitutions, did not rebut the parole board's motion for judgment on the pleadings; therefore, the Missouri Court of Appeals held that the denial of the parolee's motion was not subject to appellate review.