

**TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES
CASE NO. 22-0007326 CAF**

**GARRETT MCGUIRE,
Complainant**

v.

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

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

BEFORE THE OFFICE

OF

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

DECISION AND ORDER

Garrett McGuire (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 his 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. 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 February 24, 2023, in Austin, Texas, before Hearings Examiner Andrew Kang, and the record closed on the same day. The Complainant, represented himself herself. John Chambless, attorney, 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); see *Vance v. My Apartment Steak House, Inc.*, 677 S.W.2d 480, 482 (Tex. 1984) (“[A] civil litigant who asserts an affirmative claim for relief has the burden to persuade the finder of fact of the existence of each element of his cause of action.”).

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 and limits what may be addressed 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 Because the complaint determines the relevant issues, the Department cannot order relief for an issue not included in the complaint unless tried by consent.²³ The parties may expressly or impliedly consent to hearing issues not included in the complaint.²⁴ Implied consent occurs when a party introduces evidence on an unpleaded issue without objection.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 *See* TEX. GOV’T CODE §§ 2001.141(b)-(c), 2001.051-2001.052; TEX. R. CIV. P. 301.

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

²⁵ *See Gadd v. Lynch*, 258 S.W.2d 168, 169 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1953, writ ref’d).

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 December 16, 2020, the Complainant, purchased a new 2020 Land Rover Defender from Land Rover Austin, a franchised dealer of the Respondent, in Austin, Texas. The vehicle had 25 miles on the odometer at the time of purchase. The vehicle's limited warranty provides coverage for four years or 50,000 miles, whichever occurs first.

On or about February 2, 2022, the Complainant provided a written notice of defect to the Respondent. On February 2, 2022, the Complainant filed a complaint with the Department alleging that the driver's side passenger door was misaligned. In relevant part, the Complainant took the vehicle to a dealer for repair of the alleged issues as follows:

Date	Miles	Issue
04/28/21	5,733	Door hard to open
05/17/21	6,416	Door seal contacts rear quarter panel
12/17/21	15,749	Loose door panel causing loose glass
01/26/22	15,935	Door hangs when opening
12/13/22	27,464	Door sticks or will not open

Complainant affirmed that driver's side passenger door had an alignment issue. testified that the first four repairs made marginal improvements. However, the issue was slowly coming back. Complainant first noticed the issue roughly four months after purchase. He did not notice the issue when he first purchased the vehicle. Instead, the issue was progressive over four months of use. Complainant described that at first, the door was hard to open. His children could not open the door. The issue was worse when wet. The door would not open from inside or outside of car. He could still feel a difference in the door compared to opening the other three doors. The last time the issue was a substantial problem was when Mr. Sangster recommended additional work. The other three doors functioned normally. The rear hatch had bolts sheared off, which was repaired. Complainant believed the door had an underlying issue, which led to replacing a piece of glass. The dealership's service team did not diagnose the problem correctly until Mr. Sangster's

²⁷ 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.209(a).

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

involvement. Upon clarifying questions, Complainant stated that he was provided a loaner vehicle, except for the last repair visit, for which he was reimbursed for a rental vehicle. He estimated the vehicle was out of service for repair about 30 to 35 days.

C. Inspection

Upon inspection at the hearing, the odometer displayed 29,291 miles. The door at issue appeared to open and close normally.

D. Analysis

As a threshold matter, to qualify for any relief, a vehicle must have a defect covered under warranty (warrantable defect). repurchase or replacement To qualify for repurchase or replacement, a warrantable defect must create a serious safety hazard or substantially impair the use or market value of the vehicle after a reasonable number of attempts. In addition, the Respondent must have been given written notice of the defect and an opportunity to cure the defect. As explained in the discussion of applicable law, the law imposes the burden of proof on the Complainant. Accordingly, the Complainant must affirmatively prove every Lemon Law element by a preponderance of the evidence. In this case, the complaint concerns a misaligned door. However, the misalignment did not appear to exist at the time of the hearing. Accordingly, a preponderance of the evidence does not show that the subject vehicle qualifies for relief.

1. Warrantable Defect

Lemon Law relief does not apply to all problems that may occur with a vehicle but only to defects covered under warranty (warrantable defects) that continue to exist (i.e., currently exist) after repairs.²⁹ The Lemon Law does not require that a respondent provide any particular warranty coverage nor does the Lemon Law impose any specific standards for vehicle characteristics. Rather, the Lemon Law requires a respondent to conform its vehicles to whatever coverage the warranty provides. In part, the subject vehicle's warranty states that:

JLRNA, 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; any component covered by this warranty found to be

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

defective in materials or workmanship will be repaired, or replaced, without charge with a new or remanufactured part distributed by JLRNA, at its sole option.³⁰

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

The available evidence reflects that the complained of door misalignment has been successfully repaired so the door at issue presently operates normally. The Complainant pointed out that prior repairs did not successfully resolve the issue, suggesting the existence of an ongoing underlying problem. However, the door appears to be functioning normally after the latest repair, which a body shop performed. Though the existence of an underlying problem may be possible, the law requires proof by a preponderance. In this case, the evidence reflects that the alignment defect is currently more likely than not resolved.

2. Conclusion

As explained above, to qualify for any relief, a vehicle must currently have a warrantable defect. Given the available evidence, the alleged defect does not appear to continue to exist. Accordingly, no relief applies in this case. Parties should note that the Respondent has a continuing obligation after the expiration date of the warranty to repair any warrantable nonconformities in a new motor vehicle reported to the Respondent or Respondent's designated agent or franchised dealer before the warranty expires.³²

³⁰ Complainant's Ex. 1, 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.").

³² TEX. OCC. CODE § 2301.603.

III. Findings of Fact

1. On December 16, 2020, the Complainant, purchased a new 2020 Land Rover Defender from Land Rover Austin, a franchised dealer of the Respondent, in Austin, Texas. The vehicle had 25 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
04/28/21	5,733	Door hard to open
05/17/21	6,416	Door seal contacts rear quarter panel
12/17/21	15,749	Loose door panel causing loose glass
01/26/22	15,935	Door hangs when opening
12/13/22	27,464	Door sticks or will not open

4. On or about February 2, 2022, the Complainant provided a written notice of defect to the Respondent.
5. On February 2, 2022, the Complainant filed a complaint with the Department alleging that the driver's side passenger door was misaligned.
6. On May 3, 2022, 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 February 24, 2023, in Austin, Texas, before Hearings Examiner Andrew Kang, and the record closed on the same day. The Complainant, represented himself herself. John Chambliss, attorney, represented the Respondent.
8. The vehicle's odometer displayed 29,291 miles at the time of the hearing.
9. The vehicle's warranty was in effect at the time of the hearing.
10. The vehicle's driver's side passenger door operated normally during the inspection at the hearing.


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, repurchase, or warranty repair. The Complainant did not prove that the vehicle has a defect covered by the Respondent's warranty. TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.603, 2301.604(a), and 2301.204.
7. Reimbursement of incidental expenses does not apply 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 Respondent remains responsible to address and repair or correct any defects that are covered by the Respondent's warranty. TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.204 and 2301.603.
9. The Respondent has a continuing obligation after the expiration date of the warranty to repair any warrantable nonconformities in a new motor vehicle reported to the Respondent or Respondent's designated agent or franchised dealer before the warranty expired. 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 1, 2023

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