

Jordan Peterson v Riley Quinn, Journalism

Is There A Valid Reason For Lying To The Public? - Influencer Negligence Trial

FORT COLLINS, CO, March 13

Moments ago, at 3:07 PM, *Jordan Peterson v Riley Quinn* concluded in a stunning fashion. Here in the Larimer County Justice Center, Riley Quinn – a now infamous social media influencer – faced off against a distraught family. Peterson sued Quinn on the grounds of negligence and negligent misrepresentation. This all starts with Peterson’s diagnosis of anosmia, the complete loss of smell. February 10th, 2025 nineteen year old Jordan Peterson inhaled Therabloom – a skincare product marketed by the Defendant, where Quinn demonstrated inhaling the product giving “glowing skin.”

The only catch? This product was designed as a dietary supplement, containing menthol and capsaicin; both expert witnesses testify about the dangerous effects of these chemicals.

The question before the Courts is one of negligence, briefly defined as a failure to act as a reasonably careful person would. Citing Instagram posts and product labels, the Plaintiff alleged it was Quinn’s negligence which caused a misuse of TheraBloom, leading to a persistent loss of smell. The Defense in turn responded to these “absurd accusations” by asserting an affirmative defense of comparative negligence – meaning the Defense contends Jordan Peterson himself was negligent. Layering defenses, they further argued TheraBloom did not even cause permanent anosmia, offering a chronic sinus infection as the primary reason.

Kickstarting the trial, emotional testimony showed months of pain, suffering, and doctor visits. Peterson's mother testified “Riley Quinn ruined my son’s life and crushed his dreams.”

To highlight reasonability, Peterson claimed he had a recommendation from his cousin and Quinn was “representing the company” while having millions of followers – all whilst the attorneys combatted objections from the Defense. Most objections were overruled, but the tone of the courtroom shifted as the Plaintiff was cross examined. Astonishing new evidence was

brought to light: Jordan Peterson read the label prior to using TheraBloom. In itself, that fact may seem irrelevant, but this label warned “for oral consumption only.”

Building their case, the Defense entered business emails between Quinn and the TheraBloom company’s relations manager, showing creative freedom beyond their contract being given. Preventive steps such as marking the video as sponsored, asking for an honest ingredients list, and reviewing the sponsorship further cemented her reasonability.

But it all came crumbling down with one question on cross examination, “You did not even use TheraBloom in your advertisement, did you?”

With such a complex case, it was inevitable to have a battle of the experts evaluating causation. Dr. Sam Chen, the Plaintiff’s expert, testified the damage from TheraBloom was “immediate and irreversible.” However, Dr. Chen yielded to the fact a sinus infection — the Defense’s theory — may have worsened anosmia. Renowned Dr. Casey Torres, even after a fierce qualifications dispute, gave expert testimony for the Defense: a sinus infection “more likely than not” caused the permanent anosmia – an uncertain fact the Plaintiff was happy to emphasize. Recovering swiftly, Dr. Torres assured the jury TheraBloom did not cause permanent anosmia – definitively.

These experts were not sequestered throughout the duration of the trial, pursuant to Judge Ratnagupta’s rulings on pre-trial motions; this led the experts to draw in relevant testimony to back their conclusions. Further, pre-trial motions allowed for attorneys to stray into the well during opening statements and closing arguments.

Following a heated cross examination, attorneys and jury members alike watched as closing arguments commenced. The Plaintiff strongly emphasized “revenue over responsibility,” while the Defense declared the Plaintiff had attempted to “pull wool over the jury’s eyes.”

The public is eagerly awaiting a precedent setting verdict in the hours to come: will lying to the public be a sure fire path to liability, or is there a passable explanation?