

without the patient's consent. Supreme Court granted the application, and the Appellate Division affirmed, two Justices dissenting. The patient appeals to us as of right, pursuant to CPLR 5601 (a).

The sole ground for the patient's appeal is that Supreme Court improperly limited the patient's cross-examination of the State's psychiatric expert witness. We agree with the Appellate Division majority that, when the cross-examination is viewed as a whole, the record shows no abuse of discretion. While specific evidentiary rulings can be debated, the patient's attorney was allowed to and did make clear to the Court all the claimed weaknesses in the psychiatrist's testimony. The record does not show that Supreme Court excluded any evidence material to the only disputed issue: whether the proposed treatment was narrowly tailored to give substantive effect to the patient's liberty interest, taking into consideration all relevant circumstances (Rivers v Katz, 67 NY2d 485, 497-498 [1986]).

* * * * *

Order affirmed, without costs, in a memorandum. Chief Judge Kaye and Judges Ciparick, Graffeo, Read, Smith, Pigott and Jones concur.

Decided June 27, 2007