

**TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES
CASE NO. 22-0013690 CAF**

LACY DAVIS and DANIEL MENDEZ,	§	BEFORE THE OFFICE
Complainants	§	
	§	
v.	§	OF
	§	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	§	
Respondent	§	ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER

Lacy Davis and Daniel Mendez (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 manufactured by Ford Motor Company (Respondent). Respondent, having failed to appear, this Default Decision and Order grants warranty repair relief to Complainants.

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 October 26, 2022, by teleconference/videoconference, before Hearings Examiner Andrew Kang, and the record closed on November 30, 2022. The Complainants, represented themselves. Respondent failed to appear.

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 Complainants.¹⁹ 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.²⁰ Accordingly, the Complainants 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 Complainants 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

6. Default

If a respondent fails to appear for a hearing, the case may be disposed of informally by default.²⁹ The Department's rules provide that "[a]ll allegations shall be deemed admitted by any party not appearing at the contested case hearing on the merits."³⁰ Accordingly, the Department may issue a decision in favor of the complainant against a defaulting respondent.

B. Summary of Complainants' Evidence and Arguments

On February 3, 2021, the Complainants, purchased a new 2020 Ford Escape from Arrow Ford, a franchised dealer of the Respondent, in Abilene, Texas. The vehicle had 13 miles on the odometer at the time of purchase. The vehicle's limited warranty provides bumper to bumper coverage for three years or 36,000 miles, whichever occurs first and powertrain coverage for three years or 36,000 miles, whichever occurs first.

On or about May 2, 2022, the Complainants provided a written notice of defect to the Respondent. On May 3, 2022, the Complainants filed a complaint with the Department alleging that the sunroof will not operate, speedometer (instrument panel) goes blank, radio (infotainment screen) will freeze, driver's door makes popping sound, AC turns on and off spontaneously; the vehicle would not accelerate or turn off, and auto braking system warning light came on. In relevant part, the Complainants took the vehicle to a dealer for repair of the alleged issues as follows:

²⁷ 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.209(a).

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

²⁹ TEX. GOV'T CODE § 2001.056.

³⁰ 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.35(e).

Date	Miles	Issue
02/11/2021	733	sunroof will not operate
08/02/2021	17,079	sunroof will not operate; speedometer (instrument panel) goes blank; radio (infotainment screen) will freeze; AC turns on and off spontaneously
04/02/2022	35,778	sunroof will not operate; speedometer (instrument panel) goes blank; radio (infotainment screen) will freeze; driver's door makes popping sound
05/02/2022	37,000	car would not accelerate or turn off
05/05/2022		sunroof will not operate; speedometer (instrument panel) goes blank; radio (infotainment screen) will freeze; driver's door makes popping sound; car would not accelerate or turn off; auto braking system warning light

C. Analysis

The repair history does not show reasonable repair attempts under the statutory presumption to qualify for repurchase or replacement relief. The general statutory presumption for reasonable repairs requires four repair attempts for the same issue within 24 months or 24,000 miles after delivery, whichever occurs first. In this case, no issue had more than two repair attempts in 24,000 miles after delivery. Additionally, the facts in this case do not warrant deviating from the statutory presumption. Consequently, the vehicle does not qualify for repurchase or replacement relief. Nevertheless, the alleged defects qualify for repair relief, except the auto braking system warning light was raised after the bumper to bumper coverage expired.

III. Findings of Fact

1. On February 3, 2021, the Complainants, purchased a new 2020 Ford Escape from Arrow Ford, a franchised dealer of the Respondent, in Abilene, Texas. The vehicle had 13 miles on the odometer at the time of purchase.
2. The vehicle's limited warranty provides bumper to bumper coverage for three years or 36,000 miles, whichever occurs first and powertrain coverage for three years or 36,000 miles, whichever occurs first.
3. The Complainants took the vehicle to a dealer for repair as shown below:

Date	Miles	Issue
02/11/2021	733	sunroof will not operate
08/02/2021	17,079	sunroof will not operate; speedometer (instrument panel) goes blank; radio (infotainment screen) will freeze; AC turns on and off spontaneously
04/02/2022	35,778	sunroof will not operate; speedometer (instrument panel) goes blank; radio (infotainment screen) will freeze; driver's door makes popping sound
05/02/2022	37,000	car would not accelerate or turn off
05/05/2022		sunroof will not operate; speedometer (instrument panel) goes blank; radio (infotainment screen) will freeze; driver's door makes popping sound; car would not accelerate or turn off; auto braking system warning light

4. On or about May 2, 2022, the Complainants provided a written notice of defect to the Respondent.
5. On May 3, 2022, the Complainants filed a complaint with the Department alleging that the sunroof will not operate, speedometer (instrument panel) goes blank, radio (infotainment screen) will freeze, driver's door makes popping sound, AC turns on and off spontaneously; the vehicle would not accelerate or turn off, and auto braking system warning light came on.
6. On June 14, 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 October 26, 2022, by teleconference/videoconference, before Hearings Examiner Andrew Kang, and the record closed on November 30, 2022. The Complainants, represented themselves. Respondent failed to appear.
8. The vehicle's odometer displayed 51,356 miles at the time of the hearing.
9. The vehicle's powertrain coverage was in effect at the time of the hearing but the bumper to bumper coverage expired at 36,013 miles on the odometer.

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. A contested case may be informally disposed by default. TEX. GOV'T CODE § 2001.056.
7. All allegations shall be deemed admitted by any party not appearing at the contested case hearing on the merits. 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.35(e).
8. The Complainants' vehicle does not qualify for replacement or repurchase. The vehicle did not have a reasonable number of repair attempts. TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.604(a) and 2301.605(a).
9. 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.
10. If the Complainants' vehicle does not qualify for replacement or repurchase, this Order may require repair to obtain compliance with the Respondent's warranty. TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.204 and 2301.603; 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.208(e).
11. The Complainants' vehicle qualifies for warranty repair. The Complainants proved that the vehicle has a defect covered by the Respondent's warranty. TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.204 and 2301.603. The Complainants or an agent of the Complainants notified the Respondent

or Respondent's agent of the alleged defect(s). TEX. OCC. CODE §§ 2301.204 and 43 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 215.202(b)(3).


12. 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.
13. The Respondent has a continuing obligation after the expiration date of the warranty to address and repair or correct any warrantable nonconformities 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 Complainants' petition for relief pursuant to Texas Occupations Code §§ 2301.601-2301.613 is **DISMISSED**. It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that the Respondent shall make any repairs needed to conform the subject vehicle to the applicable warranty; specifically, the Respondent shall resolve the following issues: the sunroof will not operate, speedometer (instrument panel) goes blank, radio (infotainment screen) will freeze, driver's door makes popping sound, AC turns on and off spontaneously; the vehicle would not accelerate or turn off. Upon this Order becoming final under Texas Government Code § 2001.144:³¹ (1) the Complainants shall deliver the vehicle to the Respondent within 20 days; and (2) the Respondent shall complete the repair of the vehicle within **20 days** after receiving it. However, if the Department determines the Complainants' refusal or inability to deliver the vehicle caused the failure to complete the required repair as prescribed, the Department may consider the Complainants to have rejected the granted relief and deem this proceeding concluded and the complaint file closed under 43 Texas Administrative Code § 215.210(2).

³¹ This Order does not become final on the date this Order is signed, instead: (1) this Order becomes final if a party does not file a motion for rehearing within 25 days after the date this Order is signed, or (2) if a party files a motion for rehearing within 25 days after the date this Order is signed, this Order becomes final when: (A) an order overruling the motion for rehearing is signed, or (B) the Department has not acted on the motion within 55 days after the date this Order is signed. Accordingly, this Order cannot become final (1) while a motion for rehearing remains pending; or (2) after the grant of a motion for rehearing.

SIGNED February 21, 2023



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