

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-10902

FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT MARCH 29, 2011 JOHN LEY CLERK
---

D.C. Docket No. 1:09-cv-20585-PCH

AUTOCHINA LIMITED,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

KENNETH HUANG,  
a.k.a. Huang Jian-Hua,

Defendant-Appellee.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Florida  
\_\_\_\_\_

(March 29, 2011)

Before MARCUS and ANDERSON, Circuit Judges, and MILLS,\* Senior District Judge.

PER CURIAM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* Honorable Richard Mills, Senior United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois, sitting by designation.

Plaintiff-appellant Autochina Limited (“Autochina”) appeals from a jury verdict in favor of defendant-appellee Kenneth Huang (“Huang”). Autochina contends on appeal that the district court erred in numerous evidentiary rulings during the course of trial.

“We review a district court’s ruling on the admissibility of evidence for abuse of discretion, and evidentiary rulings will be overturned only if the moving party establishes that the ruling resulted in a ‘substantial prejudicial effect.’ When applying an abuse of discretion standard, we must affirm unless we at least determine that the district court has made a ‘clear error of judgment,’ or has applied an incorrect legal standard.” Piamba Cortes v. Am. Airlines, Inc., 177 F.3d 1272, 1305-06 (11th Cir. 1999) (citations and quotation marks omitted).

We will not reverse an erroneous evidentiary ruling if the resulting error was harmless. See United States v. Dickerson, 248 F.3d 1036, 1048 (11th Cir. 2001). “We find an error harmless where the purported error had no substantial influence on the outcome and sufficient evidence uninfected by error supports the verdict.” Id.

Autochina asserts that the district judge abused his discretion when he allowed into evidence twelve alleged hearsay statements, testimony regarding other lawsuits, and the lay testimony of Huang regarding his understanding of

Chinese law.

Based upon our careful review of the record, we conclude that the district judge did not abuse his discretion in ruling on the evidentiary issues raised in this appeal.

Even if we determined that the district judge had abused his discretion, we would still affirm the jury verdict, because the evidence adduced at trial was overwhelmingly in favor of Huang. Autochina is unable to demonstrate that the district court's rulings resulted in a substantial prejudicial effect.

**AFFIRMED.**