A bicycle crash can look simple from the curb and become complicated the moment the insurance carrier starts asking questions. The driver says the cyclist came out of nowhere. The cyclist insists the car turned across the bike lane without warning. A witness saw only the last second. The police report captures a sketch, a few statements, and maybe a citation, but not the full chain of events.

That gap between what happened and what can be proved is where accident reconstruction becomes valuable. A Bicycle Accident Lawyer does not use reconstruction in every case. Some claims are straightforward enough that photographs, medical records, and witness testimony are enough. But when liability is disputed, injuries are severe, or the defense is trying to shift blame onto the rider, reconstruction can move a case from competing stories to a fact-based explanation grounded in physics, roadway design, timing, and damage patterns.

The public often imagines accident reconstruction as dramatic courtroom animation. Sometimes those visuals do appear later. The real work is much more methodical. It starts early, often before tire marks fade, before a damaged bicycle gets repaired or discarded, and before a vehicle's data disappears. A strong lawyer knows when to bring in the right expert, what evidence must be preserved, and how the reconstruction fits into the broader legal strategy.

The point of reconstruction is not spectacle, it is proof

At its core, accident reconstruction tries to answer a few practical questions. Where was each person before impact? How fast were they moving? Who had the right of way? Could either party have avoided the collision? Did lighting, sight lines, road design, or a vehicle maneuver create the danger?

Those questions matter because bicycle injury claims often turn on very specific allegations. A driver may argue the cyclist was outside the bike lane. An insurer may claim the rider was traveling too fast downhill to stop in time. A defense expert may say the bicycle was poorly lit at dusk. Without reconstruction, these arguments can sound plausible even when they are wrong.

In one urban intersection case, for example, a driver claimed he never saw the cyclist because she was "flying" through the crosswalk area after the signal changed. The cyclist had multiple fractures and no memory of the impact. At first glance, the defense theory had traction. But a reconstruction specialist mapped the scrape marks on the SUV, measured the resting positions, analyzed nearby security footage frame by frame, and compared the

timing sequence of the traffic signal. The result was much less dramatic and much more persuasive: the cyclist entered lawfully, the vehicle turned late, and the impact angle showed the front passenger side of the SUV cut directly across her path. The speed estimate for the bicycle was modest. That changed settlement posture almost immediately.

What a Bicycle Accident Lawyer looks for at the start

Good reconstruction depends on good inputs. A lawyer handling a bicycle case will often begin by treating the crash scene and the damaged property as evidence, not just background. That mindset matters. Time erases details quickly.

A roadway can be repaved. A bent wheel can be thrown away. Nearby businesses can overwrite surveillance footage in a matter of days. Modern vehicles may contain event data, but that information is not always retained indefinitely, especially if the car is repaired, sold, or salvaged.

Early case work often includes preserving and collecting:

- photographs of the scene, bicycle, vehicle, helmet, clothing, and visible injuries
- measurements of lane widths, shoulder space, sight obstructions, skid marks, gouges, and debris fields
- digital evidence such as surveillance video, dashcam footage, bike computer data, phone records, and vehicle event data
- witness statements taken while memory is fresh
- police records, 911 audio, dispatch logs, and body camera footage where available

That list is short, but each item can open a deeper line of analysis. A crushed fork can indicate principal direction of force. A helmet strike pattern can support or contradict a claimed trajectory. A bike computer may show speed, braking, and route history. A dispatch recording may capture a spontaneous admission before anyone has lawyered up.

The lawyer's job is not to become an engineer. It is to recognize when those pieces can answer the disputed issue and to make sure they are not lost.

Reconstruction starts with the roadway, because roads tell the truth

People misremember collisions all the time. Road surfaces usually do not. Even when a witness is sincere, stress distorts perception. A driver who says, "He swerved into me," may really mean, "I noticed him only at the last instant." A rider who says, "I had plenty of space," may be describing a feeling rather than a measurable clearance.

A reconstruction expert begins with fixed physical facts. Where are the lane lines? Is there a painted bike lane, a buffered lane, a sharrow, a parking lane, or no bicycle facility at all? Is the road crowned? Does it slope downhill at 3 percent or 6 percent? Are there parked cars that create a door zone? Is there a hedge, utility pole, bus shelter, or line of parked SUVs that blocks sight distance?

Those details shape the analysis in ways that non-lawyers often miss. Consider a right-hook collision, where a driver passes a cyclist and then turns right across the cyclist's path. The defense may insist the cyclist "rode into the side of the car." That wording is technically possible and legally misleading. If the roadway geometry shows a narrow bike lane trapped between moving traffic and parked cars, and if the turn radius and damage location indicate the driver cut sharply across the lane, reconstruction can explain why the cyclist had little or no realistic

escape path. It is one thing to say a rider could have braked. It is another to calculate perception-reaction time, bicycle stopping distance, and the remaining gap after the turning vehicle encroached.

In practice, that difference can determine whether comparative fault becomes a serious issue or a weak bargaining tactic.

Speed estimates are more nuanced with bicycles than with cars

Jurors and adjusters tend to overestimate bicycle speed. Riders look fast, especially from inside a vehicle. A Bicycle Accident Lawyer who understands reconstruction knows that bicycle speed analysis requires care. There may be no long tire marks. Many bikes lack onboard data. Rider weight, grade, tire type, road condition, and braking dynamics all affect stopping distance.

Still, speed can often be estimated through multiple sources. Video is increasingly common. Even low-resolution footage can be useful if the expert can identify fixed reference points and count frames. Damage patterns can help. So can throw distance, though bicycle crashes are more complex than simple car-versus-car impacts because the bicycle and rider separate and behave differently after contact. GPS data from a cycling app or bike computer may provide speed points, though accuracy varies.

A seasoned lawyer will be careful not to oversell precision. In most real cases, a reliable range is more credible than a false single-number certainty. Saying a cyclist was likely traveling between 14 and 18 miles per hour on level pavement, based on video timing and scene measurements, is stronger than insisting the exact speed was 16.7 miles per hour if the underlying data do not support that level of precision.

The same restraint applies to vehicle speed. A defense may point to a posted 35 mile per hour limit and assume the driver was lawful. Reconstruction asks a better question: was the vehicle traveling at a speed safe for the conditions, visibility, and impending turn? A driver moving at 32 miles per hour while approaching a known bike crossing at dusk may still have failed to operate safely.

How vehicle damage and bicycle damage tell a story

One of the most useful parts of reconstruction in bicycle cases is matching the physical damage between the bicycle, the rider, and the vehicle. Cars leave signatures. So do bikes. The height of a hood dent, the smear pattern on a fender, the scrape on a pedal, and the deformation of a wheel can all help identify angle, sequence, and point of contact.

This is especially important when there is a claim that the cyclist caused the collision by striking the vehicle from behind or from an unexpected direction. A side mirror clipped from front to back tells a different story than one snapped in reverse. A front wheel folded laterally may indicate a side impact rather than a direct rear-end strike. Paint transfer on a frame can place contact more accurately than recollection alone.

In a dooring case, for instance, the driver may say the cyclist had room to avoid the opened door. Reconstruction can examine the bicycle's handlebar damage, the door hinge position, the lane width, and the rider's available lateral space. On many city streets, the answer is obvious once measured: there was no safe path left because the rider was boxed in by moving traffic. What sounds like a split-second choice in conversation becomes a predictable trap in reconstruction.

The rider's injuries also matter, though lawyers and experts have to be careful. Injury biomechanics is its own field. A broken clavicle, road rash pattern, pelvic fracture, or head impact location can support a sequence of events, but medical findings should be integrated with, not substituted for, scene analysis.

Video changed the field, but it did not eliminate judgment

Many people assume video solves everything. Sometimes it does. More often, it narrows the dispute while leaving room for interpretation. Camera angle can distort distance. Frame rate affects timing. A parked truck or tree branch can block the critical half-second before impact. Surveillance systems often record over compressed footage that makes subtle motion hard to evaluate.

An experienced lawyer knows how to use video without becoming captive to it. That may mean locating multiple camera angles from nearby homes, buses, storefronts, or intersection poles. It may mean sending preservation requests immediately. In one corridor crash, a single gas station camera seemed useless because it did not show the point of impact clearly. A second camera from a laundromat across the street captured the reflection ***bicycle accident attorney*** in a plate glass window. That reflection, poor as it looked at first, helped establish the turn sequence and defeat an argument that the rider entered against the light.

Video also works best when paired with on-the-ground measurements. If an expert can identify the exact crosswalk line, curb return, or utility box visible in the footage and then measure those features at the scene, timing analysis becomes much stronger. Without that foundation, a video opinion can start to sound impressionistic.

Human factors often decide whether negligence can be explained clearly

Accident reconstruction is not only about speed and angles. Human factors analysis often matters just as much, especially in bicycle cases where conspicuity and reaction time are disputed. Did the driver have an unobstructed view long enough to perceive and respond to the cyclist? Was the cyclist visible under the lighting conditions? Did the driver scan the bike lane before turning? Was the cyclist in a place a reasonably attentive driver should have expected?

These are not abstract questions. They often determine whether a case settles or proceeds to trial.

A common defense theme is, "I looked, but I did not see him." Human factors work can unpack that statement. Sometimes it points to inattention. Sometimes to a failure to appreciate closing distance. Sometimes to a visual obstruction created by windshield pillars or parked vehicles. In a left-turn crash, for example, a driver may focus on oncoming cars and fail to register an approaching cyclist because the brain prioritizes larger threats. That is not an excuse, but it is a recognizable mechanism that can be explained convincingly.

On the bicycle side, visibility issues can cut both ways. If a rider had no front light on a dark rural road, that fact may materially affect fault analysis. A good Bicycle Accident Lawyer does not ignore bad facts. The better approach is to test how much they actually mattered. Was the road illuminated by commercial lighting? Did the driver's headlights provide adequate illumination? Was the cyclist's reflective clothing visible? Was the vehicle drifting onto the shoulder anyway? Reconstruction can separate a genuine causation issue from a generic blame argument.

Reconstruction helps with comparative fault, not just outright liability

Most serious bicycle claims do not turn on a single yes-or-no question. They turn on allocation. Maybe the driver made an unsafe turn, but the cyclist was descending fast. Maybe the cyclist lawfully occupied the lane, but crossed a faded lane marking while avoiding debris. Maybe both parties had opportunities to reduce risk in the final second.

That is where reconstruction can be especially valuable. It can shrink exaggerated allegations into proportion. A defense may argue the cyclist was 50 percent at fault because he was not exactly centered in the bike lane. But if the lane was partially blocked by a storm grate, parked car encroachment, or broken pavement, and if the primary collision dynamics show the motorist's movement created the impact zone, comparative fault may fall to a much smaller and more defensible number.

That matters in settlement discussions because insurers price risk. Clear reconstruction can turn an inflated blame narrative into a narrower dispute over modest percentage allocation. In practical terms, that can move the value of a claim dramatically.

Not every case needs a full reconstruction team

One of the more important judgments a lawyer makes is whether the cost of reconstruction is justified. Experts can be expensive. A case involving catastrophic injury, disputed liability, and permanent disability may warrant a full engineering analysis, drone mapping, and animation. A lower-value case with clear video and an admitting driver may not.

That decision involves several factors:

- the seriousness of the injuries and the economic value of the claim
- whether liability is genuinely disputed or only rhetorically contested
- the quality of available physical evidence
- whether the jurisdiction has comparative fault rules that make allocation especially important
- how likely the case is to be tried before a jury

A careful lawyer also considers timing. Sometimes an early consulting expert is enough to guide investigation and negotiation without preparing a full trial package. In other cases, it makes sense to wait until core discovery is complete, especially if there is hope the defense version will collapse under deposition testimony. Strategy matters. Spending money on the wrong expert too early can be wasteful. Waiting too long can mean the evidence has gone stale.

The reconstruction expert is part of a larger proof system

Reconstruction does not stand alone. In a well-prepared bicycle case, it fits together with medical evidence, treating physician opinions, wage loss documentation, and the rider's own account of changes in daily life. The physics of the collision explain how the crash happened. The medical record explains what it cost.

This integration matters in mediation and trial. A persuasive claim is not merely, "Our expert says the driver was at fault." It is a coherent narrative backed by multiple forms of evidence. The roadway shows the turning path. The video confirms timing. The bicycle damage matches the impact point. The driver's statement conflicts with the physical evidence. The surgeon explains why the tibial plateau fracture required hardware and left permanent limitations. The employer records show months of lost work. Together, those pieces carry weight.

Jurors tend to respect tangible evidence, especially when it is explained without theatrics. The best reconstruction testimony is usually calm, concrete, and modest in tone. It does not overreach. It walks the listener through measurements, photographs, timing, and reasonable inferences. Good lawyers prefer that style because it survives cross-examination.

Common bicycle crash patterns where reconstruction often matters most

Certain collision types show up again and again, and they are fertile ground for reconstruction disputes. Right-hook turns are one. Left-turn-across-path collisions are another. Dooring incidents, parking lot exits, driveway pullouts, rear-end impacts at dawn or dusk, and crashes involving trucks with wide turning arcs also generate recurring arguments about visibility and timing.

Commercial vehicle cases add another layer. Box trucks and delivery vans often have blind zones that interact badly with bike lanes in dense areas. Fleet records, telematics, route schedules, and onboard cameras can all become relevant. In those cases, reconstruction may overlap with broader negligence theories involving training, supervision, or route pressure.

Road defect cases are different again. If a cyclist crashed after striking a pothole, raised utility cover, or uneven pavement edge, reconstruction may be used to show not just that the defect existed, but that it was large enough and positioned such that it destabilized the bicycle in a foreseeable way. Those claims can be harder because they often involve notice issues and government immunities, but the same principle applies: physical evidence first, assumptions second.

What clients can do to help before the evidence disappears

Lawyers prefer to direct an investigation, but clients often control crucial evidence in the first hours and days after a crash. The damaged bicycle should be preserved in its post-crash condition if possible. The same is true for the helmet, lights, clothing, panniers, and cycling computer. Small details matter. A torn strap, a shattered lens, or an intact rear light can answer later accusations.

Photographs should be taken before repairs or cleaning whenever feasible. That includes the vehicle, if access exists, and the surrounding scene from multiple angles. If there were nearby cameras, identifying them right away can make the difference between preserved footage and permanent loss. Even a quick phone photo showing a business sign, a bus number, or a house with a doorbell camera can help the lawyer issue targeted requests later.

Memory notes also help. Not polished statements, just plain observations recorded while fresh. What direction you were traveling, what the signal showed, whether the driver said "I did not see you," whether it was drizzling, whether there was glare. Those details fade fast.

Why this work changes the value and direction of a case

When reconstruction is done well, it does more than assign fault. It changes leverage. Insurance carriers assess credibility, risk, and trial exposure. A claim supported only by competing stories invites discounting. A claim supported by mapped measurements, scene photography, video timing, and expert analysis becomes harder to minimize.

That does not guarantee a quick or generous settlement. Some defendants remain stubborn. Some facts stay messy. Some jurisdictions remain skeptical of cyclists, particularly where defense counsel can appeal to biases about lane use, helmets, or traffic behavior. But reconstruction gives a Bicycle Accident Lawyer something more durable than indignation. It provides a disciplined explanation of what happened and why the defense version does not fit the physical evidence.

For injured riders, that can be the difference between being treated as an unreliable participant in traffic and being recognized as what they are, a person whose path was interrupted by a preventable act. In serious cases,

that distinction carries through every phase of the claim, from initial demand to expert disclosure to mediation to verdict.

The strongest bicycle cases are rarely built on volume. They are built on detail. A scrape on aluminum, a frame count in a grainy video, a measured sight line at an intersection, a door opened twelve inches into a narrow lane, a turning radius that leaves no room to escape. Accident reconstruction turns those details into proof, and proof is what moves cases.

CGH Injury Lawyers
2701 Lawrence St Suite 201
Denver, CO 80205, United States
Phone: +1 720-669-8062

FAQ About Bicycle Accident Lawyer

Who is at fault if a car hits a bicycle?

Fault depends on the evidence and the traffic rules that applied to the collision. A driver, cyclist, or another party may share responsibility. Police reports, witness accounts, video, and the physical evidence can help establish what happened. A collision with a car does not automatically determine legal fault.

Can you sue someone for hitting you on a bike?

You may have a claim when another person's negligent conduct causes your injuries and losses. The available evidence, applicable deadlines, insurance coverage, and any shared fault affect your options. A lawyer can review

the circumstances and explain whether an insurance claim or lawsuit is appropriate; compensation is not guaranteed.

What percentage does an injury lawyer usually take?

There is no single percentage that applies to every injury case. Many lawyers use a contingency fee based on a share of the recovery, with the terms stated in a written agreement. Ask how the percentage is calculated, whether it changes during litigation, and how case expenses are handled before signing.