



Following the jury verdict, plaintiffs timely filed her post-trial motion seeking judgment n.o.v., or in the alternative a new trial, asserting that the jury verdict was against the weight of the evidence, and that no reasonable person could conclude that plaintiff was not injured as a result of defendant's negligence.

When reviewing a jury's verdict, the evidence must be viewed in the light most favorable to the verdict winner. Boutte v. Seitchik, 719 A.2d 319 (Pa. Super. 1998). A jury's determination is not to be disturbed as long as there is sufficient evidence on the record to support it. Fannin v. Cratty, 331 Pa. Super. 326, 480 A.2d 1056 (1984). It is the province of the jury to determine the credibility of each witness. Commonwealth v. Glover, 399 Pa. Super 610, 582 A.2d 1111 (1990). The jury may decide to accept all, some or none of a witness's testimony. Id.

In the instant matter the plaintiff claimed she suffered neck and back injuries as a result of the accident. She admitted that on several prior occasions, she had received injuries to her neck and back. Moreover, defendant's medical expert testified that plaintiff's problems were existent at the time of this accident. Hence, there was sufficient evidence in the record for the jury to conclude that defendant's negligence was not a substantial factor in causing plaintiff's injuries.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the plaintiff's post-trial motion was properly denied. Judgment in favor of the defendant as entered on January 30, 2001, should be affirmed.

By the Court:

---

Myrna Field, J.