



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

## ODI RESUME

Investigation: RP 04-001  
 Prompted By: Phillip N. McBroom  
 Date Opened: 03/01/2004 Date Closed: 06/22/2004  
 Principal Investigator: John Ridgley  
 Subject: Remedy Failures Of Recall 98V-184

Manufacturer: DaimlerChrysler Corporation  
 Products: 1997 Dodge Intrepid  
 Population: 96,445 (Estimated)

Problem Description: Alleged failure of the fuel injection fuel rails and/or fuel injector/rail o-rings, allowing fuel to contact ignition sources in the engine compartment and causing engine compartment fires.

### FAILURE REPORT SUMMARY

	ODI	Manufacturer	Total
Complaints:	25	0	0
Crashes/Fires:	4	0	0
Injury Incidents:	0	0	0
# Injuries:	0	0	0
Fatality Incidents:	0	0	0
# Fatalities:	0	0	0
Other*:	0	0	0

\*Description of Other:

Action: Deny recall petition, RP04-001.

Engineer: John Ridgley *SL*

Date: 06/22/2004

Div. Chief:

Date: 06/22/2004

Office Dir.: Kathleen C. DeMeter

Date: 06/22/2004

Summary: The petitioner, Philip McBroom, alleges that there was a fuel leak in the fuel rail, and or fuel o-rings, which caused an engine compartment fire. This event occurred after the recall (98V-184) remedy was performed on his vehicle. He has petitioned the NHTSA to investigate the remedy adequacy of safety recall 98V-184.

On August 10, 1998, DaimlerChrysler notified the agency that it would recall approximately 722,600 vehicles built with 3.5l V6 engines, including the 1997 Intrepid. DaimlerChrysler reported that a fuel leak could result from deteriorated o-rings or hairline cracks in the plastic fuel rails. Follow-up investigations, RQ98-018 and RP00-001, established that post repair leakage complaints would level off to approximately 20 per year and most are not related to the recall remedy. Since these investigations, there has been no new information that would indicate any basis for initiating a new investigation.

For the foregoing reasons, further expenditure of the agency's investigative resources on the issues raised by the petition does not appear to be warranted and the petition is denied. For details, see federal register, vol. 69, no. 111 (June 9, 2004).