

FILED

FEB 12 2020

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JON MUSIAL, a single man,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

TELESTEPS, INC., a New York
corporation; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 18-16867

D.C. No. 2:14-cv-01999-JJT

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
John Joseph Tuchi, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted February 6, 2020
Phoenix, Arizona

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, GRABER, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Following a jury verdict for Defendants, Plaintiff Jon Musial timely appeals. He seeks a new trial, challenging six evidentiary rulings. Reviewing for abuse of discretion, Harper v. City of Los Angeles, 533 F.3d 1010, 1030 (9th Cir. 2008), we affirm.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

The district court's disputed evidentiary rulings were not an abuse of discretion. Although another court could have ruled differently, the district court's rulings were not "illogical, implausible, or without support in inferences that may be drawn from facts in the record." United States v. Hinkson, 585 F.3d 1247, 1251 (9th Cir. 2009) (en banc). Furthermore, any potential error in the district court's rulings did not prejudice Plaintiff to the degree necessary to mandate reversal or a new trial. See Harper, 533 F.3d at 1030 (holding that reversal on account of an evidentiary ruling requires a conclusion that, "more probably than not, the lower court's error tainted the verdict" (internal quotation marks omitted)).

AFFIRMED.