

**TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES
CASE NO. 20-0012336 CAF**

**BRITTANY REDMOND and
COURTLAN ROLAND,
Complainants**

v.

**JAGUAR LAND ROVER NORTH
AMERICA, LLC,
Respondent**

and

**JP MORGAN CHASE BANK NA,
Intervenor**

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

**BEFORE THE OFFICE
OF
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS**

DECISION AND ORDER

Courtlan Roland and Brittany Redmond (Complainants) filed a complaint with the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles (Department) seeking relief pursuant to Texas Occupations Code §§ 2301.601-2301.613 (Lemon Law) for alleged warrantable defects in their vehicle distributed by Jaguar Land Rover North America, LLC (Respondent). A preponderance of the evidence does not show that the subject vehicle continues to have a warrantable defect after repairs. Consequently, the Complainants’ vehicle does not qualify for repurchase/replacement or warranty repair.

I. Procedural History, Notice and Jurisdiction

Matters of notice of hearing¹ and jurisdiction were not contested and are discussed only in the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. The hearing in this case convened on November 16, 2020, in Carrollton, Texas for the test drive only and reconvened on November 20, 2020, by videoconference, before Hearings Examiner Andrew Kang, and the record closed on December

¹ TEX. GOV’T CODE § 2001.051.

14, 2020. The Complainants represented themselves. John Chambless, attorney, represented the Respondent.

II. Discussion

A. Applicable Law

1. Repurchase/Replacement Relief Requirements

A vehicle qualifies for repurchase or replacement if the respondent cannot “conform a motor vehicle to an applicable express warranty by repairing or correcting a defect or condition that creates a serious safety hazard or substantially impairs the use or market value of the motor vehicle after a reasonable number of attempts.”² In other words, (1) the vehicle must have a defect covered by an applicable warranty (warrantable defect); (2) the defect must either (a) create a serious safety hazard or (b) substantially impair the use or market value of the vehicle; and (3) the defect must currently exist after a “reasonable number of attempts” at repair.³ In addition, the Lemon Law imposes other requirements for repurchase/replacement relief, including (1) a written notice of the defect to the respondent, (2) an opportunity to cure by the respondent, and (3) a deadline for filing a Lemon Law complaint.

a. Serious Safety Hazard

The Lemon Law defines “serious safety hazard” as a life-threatening malfunction or nonconformity that: (1) substantially impedes a person’s ability to control or operate a vehicle for ordinary use or intended purposes, or (2) creates a substantial risk of fire or explosion.⁴

b. Substantial Impairment of Use or Value

i. Impairment of Use

In determining substantial impairment of use, the Department considers “whether a defect or nonconformity hampers the intended normal operation of the vehicle.” For instance, “while a

² TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.604(a).

³ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.604(a).

⁴ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.601(4).

vehicle with a non-functioning air conditioner would be available for use and transporting passengers, its intended normal use would be substantially impaired.”⁵

ii. Impairment of Value

The Department applies a reasonable purchaser standard for determining whether a defect substantially impairs the value of a vehicle. The reasonable purchaser standard “does not require an owner to present an expert witness or any technical or market-based evidence to show decreased value.” Instead, under this standard, “factfinders should put themselves in the position of a reasonable prospective purchaser of the subject vehicle and determine (based on the evidence presented) if the current condition of the vehicle would deter them from buying the vehicle or substantially negatively affect how much they would be willing to pay for the vehicle.”⁶

c. Reasonable Number of Repair Attempts

Generally, a rebuttable presumption is established that the vehicle had a reasonable number of repair attempts if:

[T]he same nonconformity continues to exist after being subject to repair four or more times by the manufacturer, converter, or distributor or an authorized agent or franchised dealer of a manufacturer, converter, or distributor and the attempts were made before the earlier of: (A) the date the express warranty expires; or (B) 24 months or 24,000 miles, whichever occurs first, following the date of original delivery of the motor vehicle to the owner.⁷

Alternatively, for serious safety hazards, a rebuttable presumption is established that the vehicle had a reasonable number of repair attempts if:

[T]he same nonconformity creates a serious safety hazard and continues to exist after causing the vehicle to have been subject to repair two or more times by the manufacturer, converter, or distributor or an authorized agent or franchised dealer of a manufacturer, converter, or distributor and the attempts were made before the earlier of: (A) the date the express warranty expires; or (B) 24 months or 24,000

⁵ *Dutchmen Manufacturing, Inc. v. Texas Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Division*, 383 S.W.3d 217, 228 (Tex. App.—Austin 2012).

⁶ *Dutchmen Manufacturing, Inc. v. Texas Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Division*, 383 S.W.3d 217, 228 (Tex. App.—Austin 2012) (“We find that this interpretation of the standard required for demonstrating substantial impairment is reasonable and consistent with the statute’s plain language which requires a showing of loss in market value. . . . [T]he Division’s interpretation that expert testimony or technical or market-based evidence is not required to show diminished value or use is consistent with the statute’s goal of mitigating manufacturers’ economic advantages in warranty-related disputes.”).

⁷ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.605(a)(1)(A) and (B).

miles, whichever occurs first, following the date of original delivery of the motor vehicle to the owner.⁸

Additionally, for vehicles out of service at least 30 days, a rebuttable presumption may be established that the vehicle had a reasonable number of repair attempts if:

[A] nonconformity still exists that substantially impairs the vehicle's use or market value, the vehicle is out of service for repair for a cumulative total of 30 or more days, and the attempts were made before the earlier of: (A) the date the express warranty expires; or (B) 24 months or 24,000 miles, whichever occurs first, following the date of original delivery of the motor vehicle to the owner.⁹

The 30 days described above does not include any period when the owner has a comparable loaner vehicle provided while the dealer repairs the subject vehicle.¹⁰

The existence of a statutory rebuttable presumption does not preclude otherwise finding a reasonable number of attempts to repair the vehicle based on different circumstances and fewer attempts.¹¹ Furthermore, the Department adopted a decision indicating that if a consumer presents the vehicle to a dealer for repair and the dealer fails to repair the vehicle, then that visit would constitute a repair attempt unless the consumer was at fault for the failure to repair the vehicle.¹²

d. Other Requirements

Even if a vehicle satisfies the preceding requirements for repurchase/replacement relief, the Lemon Law prohibits repurchase or replacement unless: (1) the owner or someone on behalf of the owner, or the Department has provided written notice of the alleged defect or nonconformity to the respondent;¹³ (2) the respondent was given an opportunity to cure the defect or

⁸ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.605(a)(2).

⁹ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.605(a)(3).

¹⁰ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.605(c).

¹¹ *Ford Motor Company v. Texas Department of Transportation*, 936 S.W.2d 427, 432 (Tex. App.—Austin 1996, no writ) (“[T]he existence of statutory presumptions does not forbid the agency from finding that different circumstances or fewer attempts meet the requisite ‘reasonable number of attempts.’”).

¹² *DaimlerChrysler Corporation v. Williams*, No. 03-99-00822-CV (Tex. App.—Austin, June 22, 2000, no writ) (not designated for publication) (Repair attempts include “those occasions when the fault for failing to repair the vehicle rests with the dealership.” Conversely, “those occasions when failure to repair the vehicle was the fault of the consumer would not be considered a repair attempt under the statute.”).

¹³ 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.204 provides that “[u]pon receipt of a complaint for lemon law or warranty performance relief, the department will provide notification of the complaint to the appropriate manufacturer, converter, or distributor.” The Department’s notice of the complaint to the Respondent satisfies the requirement to provide notice of the defect or nonconformity to the Respondent. TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.606(c)(1).

nonconformity;¹⁴ and (3) the Lemon Law complaint was filed within six months after the earliest of: the warranty's expiration date or the dates on which 24 months or 24,000 miles had passed since the date of original delivery of the motor vehicle to an owner.¹⁵

2. Warranty Repair Relief

Even if repurchase or replacement relief does not apply, a vehicle may still qualify for warranty repair if the vehicle has a “defect . . . that is covered by a manufacturer’s, converter’s, or distributor’s . . . warranty agreement applicable to the vehicle” and the vehicle owner notified the manufacturer, converter, distributor, or its authorized agent of the defect before the warranty’s expiration.¹⁶ The manufacturer, converter, or distributor has an obligation to “make repairs necessary to conform a new motor vehicle to an applicable . . . express warranty.”¹⁷

3. Burden of Proof

The law places the burden of proof on the Complainants.¹⁸ The Complainants must prove all facts required for relief by a preponderance of the evidence. That is, the Complainants must present sufficient evidence to show that every required fact more likely than not exists.¹⁹ Accordingly, the Complainants cannot prevail where the existence of any required fact appears unlikely or appears equally likely or unlikely.

4. The Complaint Identifies the Relevant Issues in this Case

The complaint identifies the relevant issues to address in this case.²⁰ The complaint must state “sufficient facts to enable the department and the party complained against to know the nature

¹⁴ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.606(c)(2). A respondent may delegate its opportunity to cure to a dealer. A repair visit to a dealer may satisfy the opportunity to cure requirement when the respondent allows a dealer to attempt repair after written notice to the respondent. *Dutchmen Manufacturing, Inc. v. Texas Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Division*, 383 S.W.3d 217, 221 and 226 (Tex. App.—Austin 2012); Texas Department of Transportation, *Kennemer v. Dutchman Manufacturing, Inc.*, MVD Cause No. 09-0091 CAF (Motor Vehicle Division Sept. 25, 2009) (Final Order Granting Chapter 2301, Subchapter M Relief). An opportunity to cure does not require an actual repair attempt but only a valid opportunity. *Id* at 2.

¹⁵ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.606(d)(2).

¹⁶ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.204; 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.202(b)(3).

¹⁷ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.603(a).

¹⁸ 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.66(d).

¹⁹ *E.g.*, *Southwestern Bell Telephone Company v. Garza*, 164 S.W.3d 607, 621 (Tex. 2005).

²⁰ “In a contested case, each party is entitled to an opportunity: (1) for hearing after reasonable notice of not less than 10 days; and (2) to respond and to present evidence and argument on each issue involved in the case.” TEX.

of the complaint and the specific problems or circumstances forming the basis of the claim for relief under the lemon law.”²¹ However, the parties may expressly or impliedly consent to hearing issues not included in the pleadings.²² Implied consent occurs when a party introduces evidence on an unpleaded issue without objection.²³ Because the complaint determines the relevant issues, the Department cannot order relief for an issue not included in the complaint unless tried by consent.²⁴

5. Incidental Expenses

When repurchase or replacement is ordered, the Lemon Law provides for reimbursing the Complainants for reasonable incidental expenses resulting from the vehicle’s loss of use because of the defect.²⁵ Reimbursable expenses include, but are not limited to: (1) alternate transportation; (2) towing; (3) telephone calls or mail charges directly attributable to contacting the manufacturer, distributor, converter, or dealer regarding the vehicle; (4) meals and lodging necessitated by the vehicle’s failure during out-of-town trips; (5) loss or damage to personal property; (6) attorney fees, if the complainant retains counsel after notification that the respondent is represented by counsel; and (7) items or accessories added to the vehicle at or after purchase, less a reasonable allowance for use. The expenses must be reasonable and verifiable (for example, through receipts or similar written documents).²⁶ However, the Department’s rules expressly exclude compensation for “any interest, finance charge, or insurance premiums.”²⁷

GOV’T CODE § 2001.051; “Notice of a hearing in a contested case must include . . . either: (A) a short, plain statement of the factual matters asserted; or (B) an attachment that incorporates by reference the factual matters asserted in the complaint or petition filed with the state agency.” TEX. GOV’T CODE § 2001.052. *See* TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.204(b) (“The complaint must be made in writing to the applicable dealer, manufacturer, converter, or distributor and must specify each defect in the vehicle that is covered by the warranty.”); TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.204(d) (“A hearing may be scheduled on any complaint made under this section that is not privately resolved between the owner and the dealer, manufacturer, converter, or distributor.”).

²¹ 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.202(a)(3).

²² 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.42; TEX. R. CIV. P. 67.

²³ *See Gadd v. Lynch*, 258 S.W.2d 168, 169 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1953, writ ref’d).

²⁴ *See* TEX. GOV’T CODE §§ 2001.141(b)-(c), 2001.051-2001.052; TEX. R. CIV. P. 301.

²⁵ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.604.

²⁶ 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.209(a).

²⁷ 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.208(b)(1).

B. Summary of Complainants' Evidence and Arguments

On February 17, 20020, the Complainants, purchased a new Land Rover Range Rover Velar from Land Rover Dallas, a franchised dealer of the Respondent, in Dallas, Texas. The vehicle had 35 miles on the odometer at the time of purchase. The vehicle's limited warranty provides bumper to bumper coverage for four years or 50,000 miles, whichever occurs first. On June 10, 2020, the Complainants provided a written notice of defect to the Respondent. On June 12, 2020, the Complainants filed a complaint with the Department alleging that the vehicle's parking brakes would engage spontaneously. In relevant part, the Complainants took the vehicle to a dealer for repair of the alleged issues as follows:

Date	Miles	Issue
06/01/20	1,953	Park brake fault detected – vehicle would not move
06/05/20	1,985	Error message for brake fault – brake not disengaging

Ms. Redmond testified that the spontaneous parking brake issue occurred twice. She confirmed the issue occurred in May and June (2020), for which the vehicle was brought in for repair on June 1st and June 5th of 2020. She described that the parking brake would malfunction when at a stop. Mr. Roland explained that the brakes would set within about two minutes while at a stop. The brakes spontaneously setting did not appear to occur under any particular conditions. Mr. Roland confirmed the malfunction last occurred in June 2020, which required the vehicle to be towed to the dealer for the second repair visit. He was driving the vehicle when one of the malfunctions occurred.

On cross-examination, Ms. Redmond elaborated that the first time the brakes malfunctioned, Mr. Roland was driving the vehicle and the second malfunction occurred with Ms. Redmond driving. Mr. Roland explained that after arriving at the parking lot, he did not engage the parking brake and he could not shift into drive or reverse. Ms. Redmond similarly testified that she was parked when the malfunction occurred. She was not aware of the electronic brake automatically applying. Ms. Redmond confirmed that the vehicle was at the dealer for repair from June 1, 2020, to June 3, 2020, and from June 5, 2020, to July 1, 2020. Ms. Redmond affirmed that she was the primary driver since picking up the vehicle on July 1, 2020. She confirmed that she had driven about 5,300 miles since the last repair.

C. Inspection

On November 16, 2020, upon inspection before the test drive, the vehicle's odometer displayed 7,285 miles. Ms. Redmond stated that the brake issue occurred twice and she had to get the vehicle towed because the parking brake would not turn off. She noted that the brake issue first occurred in May (2020). The issue last occurred in June (2020). To repair the last occurrence of the issue, the dealership needed a part shipped from the United Kingdom. The vehicle was at the dealer for over a month for the last repair visit. The test drive ended with 7,295 miles on the odometer. The vehicle appeared to operate normally.

D. Analysis

As an initial matter, to qualify for any relief, whether warranty repair or repurchase/replacement, the law requires the vehicle to have a defect covered by the Respondent's warranty (warrantable defect)²⁸ that continues to exist, even after repair.²⁹ In part, the warranty generally states that:

JLR warrants that during the warranty period, if a Land Rover vehicle is properly operated and maintained, repairs required to correct defects in factory-supplied materials or factory workmanship will be performed without charge upon presentment for service at a Land Rover retailer/authorized repairer; any component covered by this warranty found to be defective in materials or workmanship will be repaired, or replaced, without charge with a new or re-manufactured part distributed by JLR at its sole option.³⁰

According to these terms, the warranty only applies to defects in materials or workmanship (manufacturing defects).³¹

²⁸ TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.603(a), 2301.604(a); TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.204.

²⁹ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.605.

³⁰ Complainant's Ex. 7, Passport to Service.

³¹ Courts have affirmed that warranty language covering "defects in material or workmanship" do not cover design issues. *E.g.*, *Whitt v. Mazda Motor of America*, 5th Dist. Stark No. 2010CA00343, 211-Ohio-3097, ¶¶ 18-21 ("The manufacturer's express warranty in the case sub judice provides: 'Mazda warrants that your new Mazda Vehicle is free from defects in material or workmanship' The trial court found the warranty did not cover claims of design defects. . . . The problems about which Appellants complained did not fall within the applicable expressed warranty."); *see GT & MC, Inc. v. Texas City Refining, Inc.*, 822 S.W.2d 252, 257 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1991, writ denied) ("the language in the contract of May 12, 1980, expressly limited TCR's recovery only for defects in materials or workmanship to damages for repair or replacement value. No mention was made in the guarantee of remedies for design defects.").

The record shows the parking brake malfunction occurred twice. However, the Lemon Law requires the defect to continue to exist after repairs. Similarly, the Warranty Performance Law requires a currently existing defect. In this case, the last parking brake malfunction occurred in June, before the last repair visit on June 5, 2020, and the malfunction did not reoccur after the last repair attempt. Because the record does not show that the problem continued after repair, the vehicle does not meet the requirements for repurchase/replacement or warranty repair relief.

III. Findings of Fact

1. On February 17, 20020, the Complainants, purchased a new Land Rover Range Rover Velar from Land Rover Dallas, a franchised dealer of the Respondent, in Dallas, Texas. The vehicle had 35 miles on the odometer at the time of purchase.
2. The vehicle's limited warranty provides bumper to bumper coverage for four years or 50,000 miles, whichever occurs first.
3. The Complainants took the vehicle to a dealer for repair as shown below:

Date	Miles	Issue
06/01/20	1,953	Park brake fault detected – vehicle would not move
06/05/20	1,985	Error message for brake fault – brake not disengaging

4. On June 10, 2020, the Complainants provided a written notice of defect to the Respondent.
5. On June 12, 2020, the Complainants filed a complaint with the Department alleging that the vehicle's parking brakes would engage spontaneously.
6. On August 12, 2020, the Department's Office of Administrative Hearings issued a notice of hearing directed to all parties, giving them not less than 10 days' notice of hearing and their rights under the applicable rules and statutes. The notice stated the time, place and nature of the hearing; the legal authority and jurisdiction under which the hearing was to be held; particular sections of the statutes and rules involved; and the factual matters asserted.
7. The hearing in this case convened on November 16, 2020, in Carrollton, Texas for the test drive only and reconvened on November 20, 2020, by videoconference, before Hearings Examiner Andrew Kang, and the record closed on December 14, 2020. The Complainants represented themselves. John Chambless, attorney, represented the Respondent.

8. The vehicle's odometer displayed 7,285 miles at the time of the hearing.
9. The vehicle's warranty was in effect at the time of the hearing.
10. The vehicle operated normally during the test drive at the hearing.
11. The parking brake issue did not reoccur after the last repair attempt on June 5,2020.

IV. Conclusions of Law


1. The Texas Department of Motor Vehicles has jurisdiction over this matter. TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.601-2301.613 and 2301.204.
2. A hearings examiner of the Department's Office of Administrative Hearings has jurisdiction over all matters related to conducting a hearing in this proceeding, including the preparation of a decision with findings of fact and conclusions of law, and the issuance of a final order. TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.704.
3. The Complainants filed a sufficient complaint with the Department. 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.202.
4. The parties received proper notice of the hearing. TEX. GOV'T CODE §§ 2001.051, 2001.052. 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.206(2).
5. The Complainants bears the burden of proof in this matter. 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 206.66(d).
6. The Complainants' vehicle does not qualify for replacement or repurchase. The Complainants did not prove that the vehicle has a currently existing defect covered by the Respondent's warranty. TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.603 and 2301.604(a).
7. The Complainants do not qualify for reimbursement of incidental expenses because the vehicle does not qualify for replacement or repurchase. TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.603, 2301.604(a); 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.209.
8. The Complainants' vehicle does not qualify for warranty repair. The Complainants did not prove that the vehicle has a currently existing defect covered by the Respondent's warranty. TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.204 and 2301.603.

9. The Respondent remains responsible to address and repair or correct any defects that are covered by the Respondent's warranty. TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.603.

V. Order

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, it is **ORDERED** that the Complainants' petition for relief pursuant to Texas Occupations Code §§ 2301.601-2301.613 is **DISMISSED**.

SIGNED December 14, 2020



ANDREW KANG
HEARINGS EXAMINER
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES