

**TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES
CASE NO. 21-0015473 CAF**

MARIA RODRIGUEZ,
Complainant

v.

VOLKSWAGEN GROUP OF AMERICA,
INC.,
Respondent

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

BEFORE THE OFFICE

OF

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

DECISION AND ORDER

Maria Rodriguez (Complainant) 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 her vehicle distributed by Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. (Respondent). A preponderance of the evidence does not show that the subject vehicle has a currently existing defect under warranty. Consequently, the Complainant's 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 March 2, 2022, in Houston, Texas, before Hearings Examiner Andrew Kang, and the record closed on the same day. Samuel Mills, attorney, represented the Complainant. Susan Lucas, an authorized representative, represented the Respondent.

¹ TEX. GOV'T CODE § 2001.051.

II. Discussion

A. Applicable Law

1. Repurchase/Replacement Relief Requirements

Repurchase and replacement relief only apply to new vehicles.² 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.”³ 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.⁴ 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.⁵

b. Substantial Impairment of Use or Value

i. Impairment of Use

The Department applies a reasonable purchaser standard for determining whether a defect substantially impairs use. Under this standard, the factfinder considers “whether a defect or nonconformity hampers the intended normal operation of the vehicle” from the perspective of a reasonable prospective purchaser. For instance, “while a vehicle with a non-functioning air

² TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.603.

³ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.604(a).

⁴ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.604(a).

⁵ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.601(4).

conditioner would be available for use and transporting passengers, its intended normal use would be substantially impaired.”⁶

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.”⁷

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.⁸

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

⁶ *Dutchmen Manufacturing, Inc. v. Texas Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Division*, 383 S.W.3d 217, 228 (Tex. App.—Austin 2012).

⁷ *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.”).

⁸ 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.⁹

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.¹⁰

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.¹¹

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.¹² 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.¹³

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;¹⁴ (2) the respondent was given an opportunity to cure the defect or

⁹ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.605(a)(2).

¹⁰ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.605(a)(3).

¹¹ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.605(c).

¹² *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.’”).

¹³ *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.”).

¹⁴ 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;¹⁵ 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.¹⁶

2. Warranty Repair Relief

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”; the vehicle owner provided written notice of the defect to the manufacturer, converter, distributor, or its authorized agent before the warranty's expiration; and the owner filed a complaint with the Department specifying the defect.¹⁷ The manufacturer, converter, or distributor has an obligation to “make repairs necessary to conform a new motor vehicle to an applicable . . . express warranty.”¹⁸

3. Burden of Proof

The law places the burden of proof on the Complainant.¹⁹ The Complainant must prove all facts required for relief by a preponderance of the evidence. That is, the Complainant must present sufficient evidence to show that every required fact more likely than not exists.²⁰ Accordingly, the Complainant cannot prevail where the existence of any required fact appears unlikely or appears equally likely or unlikely.

¹⁵ 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 authorizes 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. A respondent forgoes its opportunity to repair by replying to a written notice of defect with a settlement offer instead of arranging a repair attempt. *Id* at 2.

¹⁶ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.606(d)(2).

¹⁷ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.204; 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.202(b)(3).

¹⁸ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.603(a).

¹⁹ 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.66(d).

²⁰ *E.g., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company v. Garza*, 164 S.W.3d 607, 621 (Tex. 2005).

4. The Complaint Identifies the Relevant Issues in this Case

The complaint identifies the relevant issues to address in this case.²¹ The complaint must state “sufficient facts to enable the department and the party complained against to know the nature of the complaint and the specific problems or circumstances forming the basis of the claim for relief under the lemon law.”²² However, the parties may expressly or impliedly consent to hearing issues not included in the pleadings.²³ Implied consent occurs when a party introduces evidence on an unpleaded issue without objection.²⁴ Because the complaint determines the relevant issues, the Department cannot order relief for an issue not included in the complaint unless tried by consent.²⁵

5. Incidental Expenses

When repurchase or replacement is ordered, the Lemon Law provides for reimbursing the Complainant for reasonable incidental expenses resulting from the vehicle’s loss of use because of the defect.²⁶ 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

²¹ “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. 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.”).

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

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

²⁴ *See Gadd v. Lynch*, 258 S.W.2d 168, 169 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1953, writ ref’d).

²⁵ *See* TEX. GOV’T CODE §§ 2001.141(b)-(c), 2001.051-2001.052; TEX. R. CIV. P. 301.

²⁶ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.604.

or similar written documents).²⁷ However, the Department's rules expressly exclude compensation for "any interest, finance charge, or insurance premiums."²⁸

B. Summary of Complainant's Evidence and Arguments

On October 5, 2020, the Complainant, purchased a new 2020 Volkswagen Tiguan from Volkswagen Clearlake, a franchised dealer of the Respondent, in Houston, Texas. The vehicle had 56 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 or about March 4, 2021, Mr. Mills, on behalf of the Complainant provided a written notice of defect to the Respondent. On August 3, 2021, the Complainant filed a complaint with the Department alleging that the engine was knocking, there was a malfunction in the steering wheel, and there was an issue with the dashboard electronics. In relevant part, the Complainant took the vehicle to a dealer for repair of the alleged issues as follows:

Date	Miles	Issue
12/31/2020	5,137	The lights on the dash and the steering wheel were flashing rapidly. There was a vibration when idling after starting the car.
01/19/2021	5,989	The lights on the dash and the steering wheel were flashing rapidly. There was a clicking noise when starting the car. The rear wipers would not turn off when used.
06/23/2021	13,103	The AC only blew cold air at time and alternated between vents. The engine was making the same clicking noise as before.

The Complainant stated that the engine was replaced by the dealership to fix the knocking sound, but she believed the sound was still present. She testified that the steering wheel controls and the rear wiper were repaired and have not had any issue since. She added that the dashboard electronics had been repaired as well.

The Complainant testified that when she first heard the knocking issue she was not sure if anything was wrong. She estimated that she first noticed the issue two weeks after she purchased the vehicle. She stated that once the dashboard lights started to malfunction she asked the

²⁷ 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.209(a).

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

dealership if the knocking sound was normal. She stated that the dashboard lights malfunctioned on December 29, 2020. She explained that she notices the knocking sound when she turns on the car in the morning and the engine idles down. She mentioned that the sound starts a few seconds after she starts the car. She noted that she is not sure if the noise continued once the vehicle was warm because she had the radio on. She added that she recently checked and the car made the knocking sound even after the vehicle warmed up. She did not believe that the weather had any effect on the noise.

She confirmed that she is the only driver of the vehicle. She estimated that she drives the vehicle 15 to 20 miles every day. She clarified that the miles she drives are mostly city miles. She confirmed that her vehicle was gas powered.

She recalled that she brought the vehicle to the dealership and they originally could not determine the issue until a QTM (quality technical manager) was able to look at the vehicle. She explained that after the QTM looked at the vehicle they determined the engine needed replacement. She testified that she took the vehicle into the shop three times for the engine knocking noise for almost a month total. She listed the three repair visits as: December 31, 2020 – January 2, 2021, January 19, 2021 – February 9, 2021, and June 23, 2021 – July 3, 2021. She stated that she was provided a loaner vehicle on the second and third repair visits.

On cross-examination, the Complainant confirmed that June 2021 was the last time she took the vehicle in for repairs. She also acknowledged that the noise during the inspection did not sound as loud as the complained of noise.

C. Inspection

The vehicle's odometer displayed 28,328 miles upon inspection at the hearing. The engine was left running for 10 minutes. The engine did not appear to produce any unusual noise and otherwise appeared to operate normally.

D. Summary of Respondent's Evidence and Arguments

Susan Lucas testified for the Respondent. She stated that the Complainant had not brought the vehicle in for enough repair attempts to qualify for Lamon Law relief. She testified that the vehicle is operating normally and there is not a substantial impairment. She requested a denial of

the Complainant claim. On cross-examination, Ms. Lucas responded that the amount of repairs the vehicle has undergone is reasonable. She also pointed out that the vehicle is still under warranty.

E. 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)²⁹ that continues to exist, even after repair.³⁰ In part, the warranty generally states that: "Except as specified in the section entitled "Limited Coverage" → page 6, Limited Coverage, this warranty covers any repair to correct a defect in manufacturer's material or workmanship (i.e., mechanical defects), except wheel alignment, tire balance, and the repair or replacement of tires."³¹ According to these terms, the warranty only applies to defects in materials or workmanship (manufacturing defects).³²

As explained above, a warrantable defect must currently exist for any relief to apply. Neither the Lemon Law nor Warranty Performance Law provides a remedy for possible future problems. Though the subject vehicle had a history of substantial problems, the evidence shows that the steering and dashboard electronics issues have been resolved, so they cannot support granting any relief. With respect to the engine knocking, the evidence does not show that it is a warranted defect that continues to exist. In particular, the vehicle did not exhibit any unusual noise during the inspection at the hearing.

²⁹ TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.603(a), 2301.604(a); TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.204.

³⁰ TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.605.

³¹ Complainant's Ex. 4, New Vehicle Limited Warranty.

³² 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.").

III. Findings of Fact

1. On October 5, 2020, the Complainant, purchased a new 2020 Volkswagen Tiguan from Volkswagen Clearlake, a franchised dealer of the Respondent, in Houston, Texas. The vehicle had 56 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 Complainant took the vehicle to a dealer for repair as shown below:

Date	Miles	Issue
12/31/2020	5,137	The lights on the dash and the steering wheel were flashing rapidly. There was a vibration when idling after starting the car.
01/19/2021	5,989	The lights on the dash and the steering wheel were flashing rapidly. There was a clicking noise when starting the car. The rear wipers would not turn off when used.
06/23/2021	13,103	The AC only blew cold air at time and alternated between vents. The engine was making the same clicking noise as before.

4. On or about March 4, 2021, Mr. Mills, on behalf of the Complainant provided a written notice of defect to the Respondent.
5. On August 3, 2021, the Complainant filed a complaint with the Department alleging that the engine was knocking, there was a malfunction in the steering wheel, and there was an issue with the dashboard electronics.
6. On October 12, 2021, 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 March 2, 2022, in Houston, Texas, before Hearings Examiner Andrew Kang, and the record closed on the same day. Samuel Mills, attorney, represented the Complainant. Susan Lucas, an authorized representative, represented the Respondent.

8. The vehicle's odometer displayed 28,328 miles at the time of the hearing.
9. The vehicle's warranty was in effect at the time of the hearing.
10. The steering and dashboard electronics issues were resolved before the hearing.
11. At the inspection during the hearing, the engine was left running for 10 minutes. The engine did not exhibit any unusual noise and otherwise appeared to operate normally.

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 Complainant 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 Complainant bears the burden of proof in this matter. 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 206.66(d).
6. The Complainant's vehicle does not qualify for replacement or repurchase. The Complainant 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 Complainant does 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 Complainant's vehicle does not qualify for warranty repair. The Complainant did not prove that the vehicle has a 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 Complainant's petition for relief pursuant to Texas Occupations Code §§ 2301.601-2301.613 is **DISMISSED**.

SIGNED May 5, 2022

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Kang", is written over a horizontal line.

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