



U.S. Department of Transportation
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

DOT Auto Safety Hotline
Vehicle Owner's Questionnaire
To Report Vehicle Safety Defects
1-888-DASH-2-DOT
(1-888-327-4235)
INTERNET: www.nhtsa.dot.gov/hotline

FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

Date Received: **RECEIVED**
07 FEB 25 2003
OFFICE OF DEFECTS INVESTIGATION

Repository
Reference No.
10001765

OWNER INFORMATION (Type or Print)

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
City: TUCSON State: AZ Zip Code: [Redacted]

Daytime Telephone Number: [Redacted]
Evening Telephone Number: [Redacted]

Email Address: [Redacted]

Do you authorize NHTSA to provide a copy of this report to the manufacturer of your vehicle? YES NO
In the absence of an authorization, NHTSA WILL NOT provide your name or address to the vehicle manufacturer.
Signature of Owner: [Redacted] Date: **2/2/03**

VEHICLE INFORMATION

17 Digit Vehicle Identification Number located at bottom of windshield on driver's side		Make	Model	Model Year
[Redacted]		FORD	TAURUS	1996
Date Purchased	Dealer's Name and Telephone Number		Engine:	Fuel Type:
01-FEB-96	Holmes Tuttle Ford		No. Cylinders	Gas
Original Owner	Dealer's City	State	Zip Code	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tucson AZ	AZ	85705	8
Transmission Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Antilock Brakes	Powertrain	Vehicle Component Code	
AUTOMATIC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cruise Control		061100 ENGINE AND ENGINE COOLING:ENGINE:GASOLINE	
Multiple Failure: 6				

FAILED COMPONENT(S)/PART(S) INFORMATION

Incident Date(s)	Failure Mileage	Failure Speed	
1999 to 2003		15	See Enclosed Letter

ADDITIONAL ITEMS TO BE COMPLETED WHEN REPORTING A TIRE FAILURE

Tire Make	Tire Model (Name or Number)	Tire Size (Example P215/65R15)
DOT No. (Example: DOTM4L9ABC036)	<input type="checkbox"/> Original Equipment <input type="checkbox"/> Prior Repair	Failure Location:
Tire Component Code	Tire Failure Type	

ADDITIONAL ITEMS TO BE COMPLETED WHEN REPORTING A CHILD SEAT FAILURE

Make:	Date Manufactured:	Model No./Name:
Seat Type:	Installation System:	
Child Seat Component Code:	Failed Part:	

APPLICABLE INCIDENT INFORMATION

(Please describe in detail the incident(s), failure(s), crash(es), and injury(es).)

Crash	Fire	Number of Persons Injured	Number of Deaths	Reported to Police
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			N

Narrative Description of Incident(s), Crash(es), and Injury(es).
Please describe (1) events leading up to the failure, (2) failure and its consequences, and (3) what was done to correct the failure; i.e. parts repaired or replaced (and if old part is available).

CONSUMER CALLED COMPLAINING ABOUT HAVING PROBLEMS WITH THE ENGINE STALLING. ALSO STATED THAT IT ONLY HAPPENS WHEN HE IS DRIVING AT NO MORE THAN 10 TO 15 MPH. DEALER WAS CONTACTED AS WELL AS THE MANUFACTURER AND NOTHING HAS HAPPENED SO FAR. TS - See Enclosed Letter

Include, if available: Police/Fire Department Report, Photos, and Repair Invoice. ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS IF NECESSARY.

The Privacy Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-502) This information is requested pursuant to authority vested in the National Highway Traffic Safety Act and subsequent amendments. You are under no obligation to respond to this questionnaire. Your response may be used to assist the NHTSA in determining whether a manufacturer should take appropriate action to correct a safety defect. If the NHTSA proceeds with administrative enforcement or litigation against a manufacturer, your response, or a statistical summary thereof, may be used in support of the agency's action.

To Whom it may concern:

Feb 03

We purchased 1996 Ford Taurus Feb. 1996. did not have problem until about 2 years later. We were going to a resort community about 6,000 to 7,000 ft. altitude Traffic was very slow about 10 to 15 miles per hour, the engine quit (another car directly behind us) Engine started immediately, no further problem. I suspected a problem with the fuel as the problem did not occur again at this time about 24,000 miles -

Drove to Montana 1,500 miles each way - coming back in the city of Salt Lake. Engine quit again. real slow traffic 10 to 15 miles per hour; instantly started again the car in back of us just about hit us.

The problem never exists in normal traffic just real slow traffic. Temperature normal no indication of any problem with the Oshorn Warning system.

This problem has occurred about 6 times exactly the same - I have called Ford Hot line on this. So far as Tuttle Ford has done several things to correct the condition but to no avail. The last time it occurred they could not find anything wrong. I have

told them about the T.F.6 module they stated it was OK, However this car build date could have been in the Catagory of the Ignition case of the Ford Law Suit. Our car does exactly as the suit states.

my wife will not drive it in heavy traffic anymore, and I'm to the point of feeling the same way. Very Dangerous situation. The car now has 49,868 miles on it.

I realize this is a very difficult problem to diagnose because of the rarity of its happening. No road test will ever find the difficulty.

My personal history

Retired -

Mechanic & Service Manager
for Pontiac, H.M.C. trucks

22 years in Great Falls, Montana

Service Manager Pontiac & H.M.C.

trucks - 14 years Kalispell Montana

Sales - Ford Cars & trucks

5 years Whitefish, Montana

[REDACTED]
Tucson AZ [REDACTED]

Phone [REDACTED]

New Ford suit in ignition case halts settlement

By David Kravets
THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

SAN FRANCISCO — One year ago, attorneys emerged from a California judge's chambers and announced a historic, pro-consumer settlement of a lawsuit accusing Ford of producing millions of defective vehicles prone to stalling.

But not one consumer has benefited from the accord, which at the time of its signing last Oct. 25 was thought to have ended seven years of combative litigation between the Dearborn, Mich., automaker and lawyers bent on suing Ford and protecting the public.

Instead of reimbursing its customers who paid or will pay about \$200 to replace thick film ignition or TFI modules that fail, as the agreement requires, Ford and plaintiffs' attorneys are defending their settlement before a state appellate court here.

Attacking the settlement, which could cost Ford more than \$2 billion, are attorneys who did not participate in the case but are nevertheless objecting to the deal on the grounds it jeopardizes public safety and should be redrafted.

Among other complaints, the objectors say the deal allows 12 million Ford vehicles that could stall at any time to remain on the nation's roads.

Yet Ford and the attorneys that sued the company aren't budging on their deal.

They say the deal was the best result given that Ford has repeatedly denied it sold defective vehicles, and was willing to challenge in the courts any findings that its vehicles were defective.

A California judge ordered that 12 million Ford vehicles be recalled after concluding they were defective.

Last year's settlement, which nullified the recall, came two months after it was reported that at least 11 deaths and 31 injuries were blamed on stalling Ford vehicles and the disclosure of internal Ford memos showing the automaker had evidence its ignition design could make hot engines suddenly fall.

The lawsuit challenged Ford's placement of the TFI module, which regulates electric current to the spark plugs.

From 1983 to 1995, in 29 models, including the popular Taurus, Mustang, Escort and Ranger, the ignition module was mounted on the distributor near the engine block, where it was exposed to high temperatures.

According to internal documents, Ford had designed it this way to save up to \$2 per vehicle and increase fuel economy.

Without the agreement, Ford would have appealed the unprecedented recall order, and each side was not willing to wait years for a final decision that would make or break their case, lawyers connected to the case say.

Jeff Fazio, the lead attorney here who sued Ford and agreed to settle, has defended the deal since it was signed as a compromise a year ago.

He said the real motivation behind the objecting lawyers is they want a piece of the \$2 million in attorneys' fees the deal awards to Fazio and the other lawyers who sued Ford.

"It's shakedown time," he said.

**THE ATTACHMENTS TO THIS
DOCUMENT HAVE BEEN REMOVED
TO PROTECT UNWARRANTED
INVASION OF PERSONAL PRIVACY
PURSUANT TO EXEMPTION 6 OF
THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION
ACT (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(6).**