

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

IN RE: 3M COMBAT ARMS
EARPLUG PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 3:19md2885

This Document Relates to:
McCombs, 7:20cv94
Baker, 7:20cv39

Judge M. Casey Rodgers
Magistrate Judge Gary R. Jones

ORDER

This Order addresses the parties’ remaining expert challenges to Dr. Packer (*Baker*), Dr. Fagelson (*McCombs*), and Dr. Driscoll in (*McCombs*), and resolves the parties’ omnibus motions to exclude these experts under Federal Rule of Evidence 702 and *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993).

I. Legal Standard

Rule 702, as explained by *Daubert* and its progeny, governs the admissibility of expert testimony. *Rink v. Cheminova, Inc.*, 400 F.3d 1286, 1291 (11th Cir. 2005). Under Rule 702 and *Daubert*, district courts are compelled to act as “gatekeepers” to ensure the reliability and relevancy of expert testimony. *Id.* (quoting *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 589). Expert testimony is reliable and relevant—and, therefore, admissible—when the following criteria are met: (1) the expert is sufficiently qualified to testify about the matters he intends to address; (2) the methodology used is “sufficiently reliable as determined by the sort of inquiry mandated in *Daubert*;

and (3) the testimony assists the trier of fact, through the application of scientific, technical, or specialized expertise, to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue.” *Id.* The Eleventh Circuit refers to these criteria separately as “qualification, reliability, and helpfulness,” *United States v. Frazier*, 387 F.3d 1244, 1260 (11th Cir. 2004), and has emphasized that they are “distinct concepts that courts and litigants must take care not to conflate,” *Quiet Tech. DC-8, Inc. v. Hurel–Dubois UK Ltd.*, 326 F.3d 1333, 1341 (11th Cir. 2003). The party offering the expert has the burden of showing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that each of these requirements is met. *Rink*, 400 F.3d at 1292.

To meet the qualification requirement, a party must show that its expert has sufficient “knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education to form a reliable opinion about an issue that is before the court.” *Hendrix ex. Rel. G.P. v. Evenflo Co., Inc.*, 609 F.3d 1183, 1193 (11th Cir. 2010) (citing Fed. R. Evid. 702) (“*Hendrix II*”), *aff’g* 255 F.R.D. 568 (N.D. Fla. 2009) (“*Hendrix I*”). Importantly, if a “witness is relying solely or primarily on experience, then the witness must explain how that experience leads to the conclusion reached, why that experience is a sufficient basis for the opinion, and how that experience is reliably applied to the facts.” *Frazier*, 387 F.3d at 1261 (quoting Fed. R. Evid. 702 advisory committee’s note to 2000 amendments). The qualifications standard for expert testimony is “not stringent” and “[s]o long as the witness is minimally qualified, objections to the level of [his]

expertise [go] to credibility and weight, not admissibility.” *Hendrix I*, 255 F.R.D. at 585.

To meet the reliability requirement, an expert’s opinion must be based on scientifically valid principles, reasoning, and methodology that are properly applied to the facts at issue. *Frazier*, 387 F.3d at 1261-62. The reliability analysis is guided by several factors, including: (1) whether the scientific technique can be or has been tested; (2) whether the theory or technique has been subjected to peer review or publication; (3) whether the technique has a known or knowable rate of error; and (4) whether the technique is generally accepted in the relevant community. *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 593-94, 113 S.Ct. 2786. “[T]hese factors do not exhaust the universe of considerations that may bear on the reliability of a given expert opinion, and a federal court should consider any additional factors that may advance its Rule 702 analysis.” *Quiet Tech.*, 326 F.3d at 1341. The court’s focus must be on the expert’s principles and methodology, not the conclusions they generate. *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 595, 113 S.Ct. 2786. The test for reliability is “flexible” and courts have “broad latitude” in determining both how and whether this requirement is met. *Kumho Tire Co., Ltd. v. Carmichael*, 526 U.S. 137, 141-42 (1999).

Finally, to satisfy the helpfulness requirement, expert testimony must be relevant to an issue in the case and offer insights “beyond the understanding and experience of the average citizen.” *United States v. Rouco*, 765 F.2d 983, 995 (11th

Cir. 1985). Relevant expert testimony “logically advances a material aspect of the proposing party’s case” and “fits” the disputed facts. *McDowell v. Brown*, 392 F.3d 1283, 1298-99 (11th Cir. 2004). Expert testimony does not “fit” when there is “too great an analytical gap” between the facts and the proffered opinion. *Gen. Elec. Co. v. Joiner*, 522 U.S. 136, 147 (1997).

“Because of the powerful and potentially misleading effect of expert evidence, sometimes expert opinions that otherwise meet the admissibility requirements may still be excluded [under Federal Rule of Evidence] 403.” *Frazier*, 387 F.3d at 1263 (internal citations excluded). “Exclusion under Rule 403 is appropriate if the probative value of otherwise admissible evidence is substantially outweighed by its potential to confuse or mislead the jury, or if the expert testimony is cumulative or needlessly time consuming,” or if it is otherwise unfairly prejudicial. *Id.* “Indeed, the judge in weighing possible prejudice against probative force under Rule 403 . . . exercises more control over experts than over lay witnesses.” *Id.* “Simply put, expert testimony may be assigned talismanic significance in the eyes of lay jurors, and, therefore, the districts must take care to weigh the value of such evidence against its potential to mislead or confuse.” *Id.*

When scrutinizing the reliability, relevance, and potential prejudice of expert testimony, a court must remain mindful of the delicate balance between its role as a gatekeeper and the jury’s role as the ultimate factfinder. *Frazier*, 387 F.3d at 1272.

The court's gatekeeping role "is not intended to supplant the adversary system or the role of the jury." *Allison v. McGhan Med. Corp.*, 184 F.3d 1300, 1312 (11th Cir. 1999). Only the jury may determine "where the truth in any case lies" and the court "may not usurp this function." *Frazier*, 387 F.3d at 1272. Thus, a court may not "evaluate the credibility of opposing experts" or the persuasiveness of their conclusions, *Quiet Tech.*, 326 F.3d at 1341; instead, its duty is limited to "ensur[ing] that the fact-finder weighs only sound and reliable evidence," *Frazier*, 387 F.3d at 1272.

II. Defendants' Experts

Plaintiffs' remaining expert challenge is directed to opinions of Dennis Driscoll. Driscoll is a mechanical engineer and board-certified noise control engineer. He obtained his master of science in mechanical engineering in 1980 and has worked as an acoustical consultant since 1998. Driscoll Rep., ECF No. 1595-67, at 3, 12. He is currently President and Principal Consultant of his own professional acoustical engineering firm, Driscoll Acoustics, LLC, which specializes in "noise measurement, noise exposure assessment, noise control engineering, and hearing loss prevention." *Id.* at 3.

Driscoll offers several opinions in McCombs' case regarding his hearing injuries and his use of hearing protection devices while in the military. More specifically, Driscoll opines that (1) McCombs faced a "significant risk" for noise-

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.