

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 22-1610**

---

SARAH SANDOVAL,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

THE CENTER FOR INNOVATIVE GYN CARE, PC; NATALYA  
DANILYANTS, M.D.,

Defendants - Appellants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.  
Peter J. Messitte, Senior District Judge. (8:17-cv-01599-PJM)

---

Submitted: January 22, 2024

Decided: March 5, 2024

---

Before GREGORY and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**ON BRIEF:** Benjamin S. Vaughan, German A. Rodriguez, ARMSTRONG, DONOHUE, CEPPOS, VAUGHAN & RHOADES, CHARTERED, Rockville, Maryland, for Appellant Natalya Danilyants, M.D. J. Kristen Wiggins, Michael K. Wiggins, WHARTON, LEVIN, EHRMANTRAUT & KLEIN, P.A., Annapolis, Maryland, for Appellant The Center for Innovative GYN Care, P.C. George S. Tolley, III, DUGAN, BABIJ, TOLLEY & KOHLER, LLC, Timonium, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Following a jury trial, the district court entered judgment for Sarah Sandoval on her claim against The Center for Innovative Gyn Care, PC (CIGC) and Natalya Danilyants, M.D., for medical malpractice. After trial, the district court denied CIGC's and Danilyants' renewed motion for judgment as a matter of law, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(b). CIGC and Danilyants appeal and argue that the district court erred in denying this motion because Sandoval did not present sufficient evidence from which the jury could conclude that they caused her injuries. We affirm.

When, as here, the “the loser of a jury trial challenges the verdict under [Fed. R. Civ. P.] 50(b), the question is whether a jury, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the winning party, could have properly reached the conclusion reached by this jury.” *Wiener v. AXA Equitable Life Ins. Co.*, 58 F.4th 774, 784 (4th Cir. 2023) (cleaned up). “Because [Sandoval] won at trial, all disputed facts must be construed in h[er] favor and [s]he must be given the benefit of all reasonable inferences.” *Id.* We review the district court's denial of the Rule 50(b) motion challenging the sufficiency of the evidence *de novo*. *Id.* Having reviewed the facts adduced at trial in the light most favorable to Sandoval, we conclude that there was sufficient evidence for a jury to find Appellants caused her injuries. We reject as without merit their appellate arguments challenging this conclusion.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. *Sandoval v. Ctr. for Innovative Gyn Care, PC*, No. 8:17-cv-01599-PJM (D. Md. May 10, 2022). We dispense

with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

*AFFIRMED*