AEROVERDICT | AVIATION LITIGATION ARTICLE

What Makes an Aviation Expert Witness Daubert-Proof

The Daubert standard aviation expert witness challenges that end cases before trial, the methodological failures that invite them, and what transparent opinion structure actually looks like.

The most expensive mistake in aviation litigation is not losing at trial. It is losing your expert before trial ever starts. A successful Daubert challenge does not just exclude testimony — it dismantles the technical foundation of the entire case. Attorneys who have experienced this know exactly how it happens: a well-credentialed expert, a compelling theory, and then a motion that exposes the absence of methodology underneath it all.

Understanding what the Daubert standard requires of an aviation expert witness, where aviation expert opinions typically fail under scrutiny, and what transparent methodology documentation looks like is not optional knowledge for aviation litigators. It is the foundation of a case that survives challenge.

The Daubert Standard and Why Aviation Cases Are Particularly Vulnerable

In Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., the Supreme Court assigned federal trial judges a gatekeeping function: evaluate whether proposed expert testimony rests on a reliable foundation before it reaches the jury. The standard applies to both the methodology the expert uses and the application of that methodology to the facts of the case.

Aviation cases are particularly vulnerable to Daubert challenge for a specific reason. Aviation accident causation involves a narrow technical domain where the pool of qualified experts is small, the subject matter is complex, and opinions based on experience alone — without structured analytical methodology — are common. Courts have become increasingly willing to exclude aviation expert testimony that relies on subjective professional judgment divorced from testable methodology. Experience in the cockpit is not, by itself, sufficient. The question is whether the expert can explain, defend, and document how they reached their conclusions.

The four factors courts apply under Daubert map directly onto the vulnerabilities aviation expert opinions frequently expose.

The Four Daubert Factors Applied to Aviation Expert Opinions

Factor One: Whether the Theory or Technique Can Be and Has Been Tested

In aviation accident analysis, testability means that the methodology produces conclusions that can be verified against objective data. FDR-based performance analysis is testable — the aircraft performance model can be validated against manufacturer data, and the conclusions can be replicated. An opinion that a crew failed to maintain adequate situational awareness,

grounded only in the expert's subjective read of the accident sequence, is not testable in any meaningful sense.

The failure mode here is common: an expert describes what happened and then concludes that the crew must therefore have lacked situational awareness, or that the operator must therefore have had an inadequate safety program. The conclusion follows logically from the outcome rather than from any independent analysis. Courts have recognized this pattern. An opinion that works backward from the accident to the cause without intermediate analytical steps is not a testable methodology — it is circular reasoning dressed as expertise.

Factor Two: Whether the Methodology Has Been Subjected to Peer Review

Peer review in aviation accident analysis does not require a published paper. It requires that the methods the expert applies are recognized and validated within the relevant professional community — accident investigators, flight operations specialists, aviation safety researchers, and regulatory bodies.

The NTSB's analytical frameworks, the FAA's published guidance on operational standards, manufacturer performance documentation, and industry-standard human factors methodologies all constitute a body of peer-reviewed, professionally accepted analytical tools. An expert who applies these frameworks and can identify the specific methodological basis for each conclusion satisfies this factor. An expert who applies novel analytical approaches not recognized within the aviation safety community — or who cannot identify any methodological basis at all — does not.

In pilot decision-making cases, this factor commonly surfaces around human factors analysis. Not all human factors frameworks are created equal. An expert applying a recognized model such as HFACS or the Dirty Dozen framework to structured crew performance data is on defensible ground. An expert asserting that a pilot made a poor decision based on a general review of the accident sequence, without applying any recognized analytical framework, is vulnerable.

Factor Three: Known or Potential Error Rate

This factor requires that the methodology have a known or potential rate of error. For quantitative aviation analysis — aircraft performance calculations, weather impact modeling, approach path reconstruction from FDR data — error rates are documentable. The methodology has tolerances. The expert can specify what those tolerances are and explain how the conclusions remain valid within them.

For qualitative analysis — standards of care, operational decision-making, crew resource management — the error rate factor is satisfied when the expert can articulate the criteria they applied, demonstrate that those criteria are derived from recognized standards, and acknowledge what factual findings would have produced a different opinion. An expert who maintains that their conclusions are certain, regardless of the evidence, fails this factor. Not because certainty is impermissible, but because an opinion without acknowledged analytical boundaries cannot be evaluated for error.

This is where transparency in methodology documentation earns its value. An expert who has documented the specific factual predicates for each conclusion — and identified what evidence would change each conclusion — can withstand this challenge. An expert who simply states their opinion and relies on credential weight cannot.

Factor Four: General Acceptance Within the Relevant Scientific or Technical Community

In aviation, general acceptance is assessed within the community of aviation accident investigators, flight operations professionals, and recognized aviation safety authorities. Methods used by the NTSB, FAA-endorsed analytical frameworks, manufacturer-specified performance standards, and industry-accepted operational criteria satisfy this factor. Methods that are idiosyncratic to the expert, disputed within the professional community, or applied in ways inconsistent with how they were designed to be used do not.

For human factors analysis in aviation accidents, general acceptance requires that the expert apply recognized methodologies in their intended manner. Aviation human factors has a well-developed body of accepted methodology. An expert who claims human factors expertise but applies frameworks inconsistently, selectively, or in ways that professional human factors specialists would not recognize is exposed on this factor.

The Methodological Failures That Get Aviation Experts Excluded

Across aviation Daubert challenges, certain failure patterns appear consistently. Identifying them matters because opposing counsel has identified them too.

Outcome-driven analysis is the most common. The expert knows the accident happened, knows the outcome, and constructs a causation narrative that explains the outcome rather than one derived independently from the evidence. Courts recognize this. The test is whether the expert's methodology would have produced a different conclusion if the facts had been different — and whether the expert can demonstrate that.

Credential substitution is the second pattern. An expert with extensive flight experience asserts opinions about accident causation, maintenance standards, or operational adequacy based on their professional background rather than on any structured analysis of the specific case evidence. Experience is relevant to qualification. It is not a substitute for methodology.

Selective data review is the third. An expert who has reviewed only the factual materials that support their opinion — and cannot account for contrary evidence in the record — is vulnerable on both reliability and fit grounds. In aviation accident investigations, the full docket is the record. Opinions built on partial review are structurally exposed.

Failure to document analytical steps is the fourth and most practically significant. If the expert cannot produce documentation showing how they moved from factual premises to analytical conclusions — what data they reviewed, what frameworks they applied, what alternative hypotheses they considered and why they rejected them — the opinion cannot be evaluated for reliability. The court cannot fulfill its gatekeeping function if the methodology is opaque.

What Transparent Methodology Documentation Looks Like

A Daubert-resistant aviation expert opinion is structured around documented analytical steps, not conclusions. The difference is visible in the report before any challenge is filed.

The factual predicate section identifies every piece of evidence the expert reviewed — specifically, completely, and with attribution. Not a general statement that the expert reviewed the NTSB docket. A specific enumeration of each factual report, each data file, each record, and what each contributed to the analysis.

The analytical framework section identifies the specific methodologies applied to each issue: which performance model was used and why, which human factors framework was applied and how, which regulatory standards were used to establish the applicable standard of care and where those standards appear in published FAA or operator documentation.

The opinion section links each conclusion explicitly to its factual predicate and analytical framework. The opinion does not assert that a pilot failed to maintain adequate situational awareness. It identifies specific flight parameters at specific moments, applies a recognized model of situational awareness assessment to those parameters, and reaches a conclusion that is traceable through each analytical step.

The alternative hypotheses section identifies what factual findings would have produced different conclusions. This is not an admission of weakness. It is the demonstration that the methodology is not outcome-driven — that the expert's opinions follow from evidence, not from the accident result.

How Opinions Are Structured to Survive Challenge

The goal of methodology transparency is not defensive posturing. It is analytical integrity. An opinion that can be fully evaluated — that can be tested against the evidence, compared against professional standards, and traced from premise to conclusion — is a more credible opinion than one that cannot.

From an operational standpoint, this mirrors what a competent accident investigation produces. Investigators who reach conclusions through documented, methodical analysis of primary evidence, who acknowledge the limitations of the evidence, and who can explain why alternative explanations were considered and rejected produce findings that hold. Experts who follow the same discipline produce testimony that holds.

The Daubert standard is not an obstacle to be cleared. It is a useful discipline. It forces the question that the attorney and the expert should be asking at the start of every engagement: not just what happened, but how do we know, how can we prove it, and what would change our conclusion if the evidence were different. That is the question good accident investigation asks. It is the question Daubert-resistant expert analysis answers.

Key Takeaways for Aviation Attorneys

- Daubert challenges in aviation cases most commonly succeed against experts who rely on credential weight rather than documented methodology. Experience qualifies. Methodology survives challenge.
- The four Daubert factors — testability, peer review, error rate, and general acceptance — each map onto specific vulnerabilities in aviation expert analysis. Know which factor opposing counsel will target before they file the motion.
- Outcome-driven analysis, credential substitution, selective data review, and undocumented methodology are the four failure patterns that most reliably produce successful exclusion challenges.
- A Daubert-resistant expert opinion is built from documented analytical steps — factual predicate, analytical framework, traced conclusions, and acknowledged alternative hypotheses. The structure of the report is the first line of defense.

— Retain your aviation expert early enough to develop a complete, documented methodology before the report is due. Exclusion challenges are much harder to mount against an opinion that can be fully traced and evaluated.

Kevin Alvarez is an ATP-rated Chief Pilot and aviation expert witness with experience in corporate aviation operations, pilot decision-making, FAA compliance, operational risk analysis, and aviation accident investigation. He provides expert witness and litigation consulting services for aviation-related matters involving Part 91 and Part 135 operations. aeroverdict.com