Harris v. Lee-Pow et al. Doc. 104

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

ALAINA HARRIS

Plaintiff \*

v. \* Civil Action MJG-14-1529

CHERYL LEE-POW, D.C., et al. \*

Defendants \*

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

## MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

The Court has before it Defendants' First Motion in Limine [ECF No. 89] and the materials submitted relating thereto. The Court has discussed the motion with counsel at the pretrial conference and finds no need for a formal hearing.

By the instant motion, Defendants seek to exclude from the trial any testimony of Dr. Nadareishvili regarding his observations of Youtube videos and of chiropractic maneuvers observed some 15 years ago at the Canadian College of Chiropractors.

The motion is well founded and may not even be disputed. In any event, the motion shall be granted.

Dr. Nadareishvili may be asked about chiropractic maneuvers utilized on the plaintiff if the question has an adequate evidentiary basis; that is, provided there is evidence from which the jury could find that the particular chiropractic

maneuver in question had been performed on Plaintiff. For example, if Plaintiff were to testify that Dr. Lee-Pow did a described chiropractic maneuver, Dr. Nadareishvili may be told to assume that this was done and asked a question about it within the scope of his expertise.

## Accordingly:

- 1. Defendants' First Motion in Limine [ECF No. 89] is GRANTED.
- 2. There shall be no reference to any observations by Dr. Nadareishvili of Youtube videos or at the Canadian College of Chiropractors.
- 3. This Order does not prohibit hypothetical questions of Dr. Nadareishvili regarding particular chiropractic maneuvers performed on Plaintiff for which there is an adequate evidentiary basis.

SO ORDERED, on Tuesday, February 9, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/ Marvin J. Garbis United States District Judge