

DAIMLERCHRYSLER

Buff 3/28/06

RECEIVED
NHTSA
702 MAR 23 12 3:11
OFFICE OF
LAW ENFORCEMENT

DaimlerChrysler Corporation
Stephan J. Spath
Director
Vehicle Compliance & Safety Affairs

March 22, 2006

Mr. Thomas Z. Cooper, Chief
Vehicle Integrity Division
Office of Defects Investigation
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20590

Dear Mr. Cooper:

Reference: NVS-212jfa; EA05-022

This document contains DaimlerChrysler Corporation's ("DCC") response to the referenced inquiry regarding alleged seat belt buckle latching difficulty on some 2002 model year Jeep Liberty ("KJ") vehicles. In reaching our analysis and conclusions, and by providing the information contained herein, DCC is not waiving its claim to attorney work product and attorney-client privileged communications.

Since the opening of PE05-046 approximately 7 months ago, DCC has completed a thorough investigation and analysis into the potential causes for complaints regarding 2002 model year Jeep Liberty driver and front passenger seat belt buckles and latch plate tongues. Based on the nature of the complaints and evaluation of related components, DCC does not believe this matter presents any unreasonable risk to motor vehicle safety.

The alleged defect as described in PE05-046 and EA05-022 includes 3 different modes: false latching of the seat belt buckle, difficulty to latch, or difficulty to unlatch.

DCC is not aware of any confirmed incidents nor has reason to believe that the subject seat belt buckles have exhibited a false latching condition.

DCC has received a small number of customer complaints alleging a difficulty latching or unlatching the seatbelt in 2002 model year Jeep Liberty vehicles. DCC has tested and evaluated many of these buckles obtained via warranty, employee

vehicle survey, and VOQ returns. All of the buckle assemblies were able to be fully latched and unlatched without compromise to the integrity of the latchplate engagement.

There are several factors that may contribute to difficulty latching and unlatching including, but not limited to contamination and abuse. DCC also identified in some sample buckle assemblies that the latch guide leaf springs were fractured and/or separated. The latch guide leaf spring acts to aid the return of the button to the original position after latching or unlatching. A fractured and/or separated latch guide leaf spring does not prevent the full and complete engagement of the latchplate into the buckle.

DCC does not believe the level of the customer inputs associated with this inquiry is indicative of a safety defect. DCC draws comparisons to the recent General Motors 2000-2001 M/Y Cadillac Deville seatbelt investigation (PE04-060) with similar allegations. That investigation involved 20 complaints of seat belts unlatching in a crash, 13 legal claims / lawsuits and 16 alleged injuries and 2 fatalities.

This investigation involves a subject vehicle population of approximately 30,000 more units and has no complaints of false latching, no lawsuits or alleged injuries. PE04-060 was closed by NHTSA on February 3, 2005 because NHTSA determined that a safety related defect trend was not identified and the further use of its resources was not warranted. DCC believes that the same conclusion should be reached here.

Sincerely,



Stephan J. Speth

Attachment and Enclosures

- Q1. State the number of each of the following, received by DCC, or of which DCC is otherwise aware, which relate to, or may relate to, the alleged defect in the subject vehicles, excluding those provided in response to PE05-046:**
- a. Consumer complaints, including those from fleet operators;**
 - b. Field reports, including dealer field reports;**
 - c. Reports involving a crash, injury, or fatality, based on claims against the manufacturer involving a death or injury, notices received by the manufacturer alleging or proving that a death or injury was caused by a possible defect in a subject vehicle, property damage claims, consumer complaints, or field reports;**
 - d. Property damage claims;**
 - e. Third-Party arbitration proceedings where DCC is or was a party to the arbitration; and,**
 - f. Lawsuits, both pending and closed, in which DCC is or was a defendant or codefendant.**

For subparts "a" through "f," state the total number of each item (e.g., consumer complaints, field reports, etc.) separately. Multiple incidents involving the same vehicle are to be counted separately. Multiple reports of the same incident are also to be counted separately (i.e., a consumer complaint and a field report involving the same incident in which a crash occurred are to be counted as a crash report, a field report and a consumer complaint).

In addition, for items "c" through "f," provide a summary description of the alleged problem and causal and contributing factors and DCC's assessment of the problem, with a summary of the significant underlying facts and evidence. For items "e" and "f," identify the parties to the action, as well as the caption, court, docket number, and date on which the complaint or other document initiating the action was filed.

NOTE: UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED IN THE QUESTION RESPONSE, THIS DOCUMENT APPENDS THE PE05-046 RESPONSE SUBMITTED OCTOBER 12, 2005. THE UPDATED INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN IS THROUGH JANUARY 30, 2006 AND DOES NOT CONTAIN, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED WITH PE05-046.

A1. The following summarizes the non-privileged reports received by DaimlerChrysler Corporation (DCC) that relate to, or may relate to, the alleged condition in the subject vehicles. DCC has conducted a reasonable and diligent search of the normal repositories of such information.

- a. There are a total of 40 complaints (VOQ + CAIR), which include 9 NHTSA reports (VOQs) and 31 complaints in the DCC system (CAIRs) that may relate to the alleged condition. Due to some complainants providing more than 1 input, there are 36 unique VINs associated with the 40 complaints.

The list of 9 VOQs received from NHTSA included 1 with a related customer complaint in the DCC system.

- b. There are no field reports.

TABLE: Number of Unique VINs / Number of Total Reports

	VOQ	CAIR	Field Report	Legal Claim	Additional CAIRs	Totals
VOQ	8	1	0	0	—	9
CAIR	1	27	0	0	3	31
Field Report	0	0	0	0	—	0
Legal claim	0	0	0	0	--	0
Total number of reports = sum of far right column = 40						
Unique VINs = sum of cells in double border area = 36						

DCC's analysis of complaints indicates that there are no verified complaints of a partial or false latch condition responsive to this inquiry or PE05-046. For purposes of this response, DCC defines false latch as any condition of partial engagement in which the latch plate tongue appears to the operator to be fully engaged.

Of the 36 unique VINs, 5 (13.9%) were too vague or lacked sufficient detail to appropriately attribute the complaint to the specific condition alleged in this inquiry.

Of the 36 unique VINs, 6 (16.7%) indicate some concern with the seat belt, but do not specify whether inoperable, broken, or identify any specific issue and therefore cannot accurately be attributed to the condition alleged in this inquiry.

The remaining 25 out of 36 unique VINs (69.5%) reference a difficulty for the seat belt to latch (12 or 33.3%) or unlatch (2 or 5.6%), or that

the button sticks (11 or 30.6%). It is DCC's opinion that these 25 inputs are the only ones that may possibly be related to the alleged condition of difficulty to latch or unlatch.

- c. There are 0 claims alleging crash, injury, or fatality that are responsive to this inquiry.
- d. There are 0 reports that allege property damage that are responsive to this inquiry.
- e. There are 0 third-party arbitration proceedings involving DCC that are responsive to this inquiry.
- f. There are 0 legal claims / lawsuits against DCC, or notices received by DCC, that are responsive to the condition alleged in this investigation ("failure of subject component(s) that either prevent or inhibit the buckle's ability to latch or unlatch, or cause the buckle to false latch").

Q2. Separately, for each item (complaint, report, claim, notice, or matter) within the scope of your response to Request No. 1, state the following information:

- a. DCC's file number or other identifier used;
- b. The category of the item, as identified in Request No. 1 (i.e., consumer complaint, field report, etc.);
- c. Vehicle owner or fleet name (and fleet contact person), address, and telephone number;
- d. Vehicle's VIN;
- e. Vehicle's model year;
- f. Vehicle's mileage at time of incident;
- g. Incident date;
- h. Report or claim date;
- i. Whether a crash is alleged;
- j. Whether a fire is alleged;
- k. Whether property damage is alleged;
- l. Number of alleged injuries, if any; and
- m. Number of alleged fatalities, if any.

Provide this information in Microsoft Access 2000, or a compatible format, entitled "REQUEST NUMBER TWO DATA."

- A2. The detailed response that lists the customer complaints from Request No. 1, as requested in Items a. through m. is provided in Enclosure 1 — REQUEST NUMBER TWO DATA, as a Microsoft Access 2000 table, titled "REQUEST NUMBER TWO DATA".**

- Q3. Produce copies of all documents related to each item within the scope of Request No. 1. Organize the documents separately by category (i.e., consumer complaints, field reports, etc.) and describe the method DCC used for organizing the documents.**
- A3. Copies of all documents within the scope of Request 1 are provided in Enclosure 2 – COMPLAINT DETAILS.**
- Q4. State a total count for all of the following categories of claims, collectively, that have been paid by DCC to date that relate to, or may relate to, the alleged defect in the subject vehicles, excluding those provided in response to PE05-046: warranty claims; extended warranty claims; claims for good will services that were provided; field, zone, or similar adjustments and reimbursements; and warranty claims or repairs made in accordance with a procedure specified in a technical service bulletin or customer satisfaction campaign. Separately, for each such claim, state the following information:**
- a. DCC's claim number;**
 - b. Vehicle owner or fleet name (and fleet contact person) and telephone number;**
 - c. Vehicle's VIN;**
 - d. Repair date;**
 - e. Vehicle mileage at time of repair;**
 - f. Repairing dealer's or facility's name, telephone number, city and state or ZIP code;**
 - g. Labor operation number;**
 - h. Problem code;**
 - i. Replacement part number(s) and description(s);**
 - j. Concern stated by customer; and**
 - k. Comment, if any, by dealer/technician relating to claim and/or repair.**

Provide this information in Microsoft Access 2000, or a compatible format, entitled "WARRANTY DATA."

A4.

23-13-01-04	12
23-13-01-05	55

It is often not possible to determine whether each particular warranty claim is in any way related to the alleged condition. There are other random issues, not related to this alleged condition, that trigger replacement of

subject components. DCC has concluded that warranty data cannot be used to determine any trend related to the alleged condition.

The detailed response that lists the warranty claims information as requested in Items a through k is provided in Enclosure 3 - WARRANTY DATA, as a Microsoft Access 2000 table, titled "WARRANTY DATA 2002".

- Q5. Describe in detail the search criteria used by DCC to identify the claims identified in response to Request No. 4, including the labor operations, problem codes, part numbers and any other pertinent parameters used. Provide a list of all labor operations, labor operation descriptions, problem codes, and problem code descriptions applicable to the alleged defect in the subject vehicles.**
- A5. The search criteria used by DCC to identify claims for Request No. 4 can be found in the chart below:**

Seatbelt, Buckle Half – Replace (Front Right)	23-13-01-04
Seatbelt, Buckle Half – Replace (Front Left)	23-13-01-05

11	Broken or Cracked
4R	Push Button Broken
61	Intermittent Operation
UC	Uncodeable

- Q6. In its October 12, 2005 response to ODI's August 31, 2005 Preliminary Evaluation (PE) information request letter (hereafter, DCC's PE response), DCC stated that it was collecting sample front seat belt buckles from subject vehicles through a "Warranty Parts Return Program" and that the program would "supply" DCC with sample buckles for "further analysis." State whether DCC has completed this program or if it is still in process. If the program has not been completed, provide the anticipated completion date. Separately, produce in chronological order, copies of all documents to date that relate to this program and for each seat belt collected to date, state the following information:**
- a. Vehicle's VIN;**
 - b. Vehicle's production date;**
 - c. Date of retail sale;**
 - d. Failure date;**

- e. Repair date;
- f. Mileage at the time of the failure;
- g. The entity that conducted the analysis; and
- h. The results of the analysis.

Provide this information in Microsoft Access 2000, or a compatible format, entitled "WARRANTY PARTS RETURN DATA."

- A6. The Warranty Parts Retention Program for the 2002 – 2006 model year (M/Y) Jeep Liberty front seat belt buckles is ongoing and will continue for at least several more months. To date DCC, in conjunction with the seat belt buckle supplier TRW Automotive (TRWA), has received and reviewed a total of 50 driver and passenger front seat belt buckle assemblies returned through warranty. This quantity includes 4 buckle warranty returns that were included in the PE05-046 response.

None of the buckle assemblies reviewed exhibited the alleged partial or false latching condition. Twenty-two of the buckle assemblies had conditions unrelated to the alleged defect including: Contamination (12), No Trouble Found (6), Damage/Abuse (3), or Other (1). The remaining 28 buckle assemblies exhibited varying degrees of difficulty latching, unlatching, or button sticking due to separated latch guide leaf springs. However, all 28 samples could be fully latched and unlatched. DCC testing (as described in the response to PE05-046) indicates that, whether or not latch guide leaf springs are intact, the integrity of the connection is not compromised once the latchplate is fully engaged into the buckle.

All 28 samples were removed from 2002 M/Y vehicles. DCC believes that 6 of these warranty buckle replacements were inadvertently categorized as 2003 – 2006 M/Y in the DCC warranty part return system.

TRWA manufactured these buckles between week 22 of calendar year 2001 (June 2nd) and week 7 of calendar year 2002 (February 18th). This correlates to vehicles built between approximately July 27, 2001 and March 1, 2002. Note that the lag between the time the buckle is manufactured and the time it is installed into a vehicle can vary. There were no warranty return buckles outside of this specific timeframe that have exhibited separated latch guide leaf springs.

The data showing the buckle build dates is provided in chart form as a PDF file, in Enclosure 4 - WARRANTY PARTS RETURN PROGRAM, titled "WARRANTY PARTS RETURN CHART". The detailed response that lists the warranty parts return data information as requested in items a through f is provided in Enclosure 4 - WARRANTY PARTS RETURN

PROGRAM, as a Microsoft Excel 2000 table, titled "WARRANTY PARTS RETURN DATA".

- Q7. Identify and describe any other programs or service actions that DCC has initiated in an effort to obtain malfunctioning buckles from the subject vehicles.**
- A7. DCC performed an employee survey within the Auburn Hills DaimlerChrysler Technology Center (DCTC) complex. The survey was performed on 2002 M/Y Jeep Liberty vehicles with the intent to provide front driver and passenger seat belt buckles for evaluation. A total of 20 vehicles were reviewed, 14 of which were utilized as sources for front seat buckle testing / evaluation. These buckles were selected because they were built in the timeframe defined by the warranty returned parts as described in response to question 6.**
- Q8. DCC's PE response to Request No. 8 (Assessments, Analyses, etc.), states in part that two sample buckles were sent to the DCC "Materials Engineering Test Laboratory" to evaluate the material properties of those buckles. State whether DCC has completed this evaluation or if it is still in process. If the evaluation has not been completed, provide the anticipated completion date. Separately, produce, in chronological order, copies of all documents to date that relate to this evaluation.**
- A8. As discussed in DCC's PE05-046 response to Request No. 8, DCC conducted a study in the DCC Materials Engineering laboratory on front seatbelt buckle buttons obtained from:**
- o VOQ complainant (Reference No. 10127030)**
 - o Front seat belt buckle obtained from DCC employee / retiree.**
- The testing has been completed and included SEM Analysis / Fractography (reports #124086 & #124144) and Chemistry (report #124216). These reports are provided in Enclosure 5 - MATERIAL TESTING and have also been previously provided to NHTSA Investigator John Abbott on January 23, 2006.**
- Q9. DCC's PE response to Request Nos. 9 and 11 (Modifications and Part sales) indicates the subject components (front seat belt buckles) used in the subject vehicles are also used in other model year Jeep Liberty vehicles. Identify all other vehicles that use the subject components by model year and periods of production. For those vehicles identified, provide production data, and, the information requested by Requests Nos. 1 through 5 above. Please label the associated files to these responses as "other vehicles," e.g., PRODUCTION DATA_OTHER VEHICLES, etc.**

- A9. The 2002 – 2006 M/Y Jeep Liberty vehicles utilize essentially the same buckle design. There were minor tooling changes in 2002 that increased radii near the latch guide leaf spring legs. There are no other DCC makes or models that use this part.

The detailed response that lists the production data information for the 2003 – 2006 MY Jeep Liberty vehicles (through January 30, 2006) is provided in Enclosure 6 – PRODUCTION DATA, as a Microsoft Access 2000 table, titled "PRODUCTION DATA_OTHER VEHICLES".

The following summarizes the non-privileged reports received by DCC that relate to, or may relate to, the alleged condition in 2003 – 2006 M/Y Jeep Liberty vehicles (through January 30, 2006). DCC has conducted a reasonable and diligent search of the normal repositories of such information.

- There are 2 customer complaints (CAIRs) with 2 unique VINs that may relate to the alleged condition.
- There is 1 Field Report with 1 unique VIN that may relate to the alleged condition.
- There are a total of 3 unique VINs.

DCC's analysis of complaints indicates that 1 of the unique VINs was too vague or lacked sufficient detail to appropriately attribute the complaint to the specific condition alleged in this inquiry. The remaining 2 unique VINs reference a difficulty for the seat belt to latch (1) or unlatch (1). It is DCC's opinion that these 2 inputs are the only ones that may possibly be related to the alleged condition of difficulty to latch or unlatch.

There is 1 claim alleging crash that is potentially responsive to this question involving a 2004 M/Y Jeep Liberty. The owner alleged that her daughter was driving and involved in an accident (November 11, 2004) in which the belt did not hold her in the seat and became disconnected upon impact. The owner reported no injuries and has not provided a police report, insurance information and the location of the vehicle for inspection despite requests for the same from DCC. Neither the owner nor the driver has made further contact with DCC since November of 2004. Accordingly, DCC is unable to reach a conclusion concerning the allegation. This claim is the only customer complaint DCC is aware of involving an allegation of false latch of the driver buckle.

There are 0 claims alleging injury or fatality that are responsive to this inquiry.

There are 0 reports that allege property damage that are responsive to this Inquiry.

There are 0 third-party arbitration proceedings involving DCC that are responsive to this inquiry.

There are 0 legal claims / lawsuits against DCC, or notices received by DCC, that are responsive to the condition alleged in this investigation ("failure of subject component(s) that either prevent or inhibit the buckle's ability to latch or unlatch, or cause the buckle to false latch").

The detailed response that lists the customer complaints and field reports, for 2003 – 2006 M/Y Jeep Liberty vehicles (through January 30, 2006), as requested in item 2 is provided in Enclosure 1 – REQUEST NUMBER TWO DATA, as a Microsoft Access 2000 table, titled "REQUEST NUMBER TWO DATA_OTHER VEHICLES".

Copies of all documents within the scope of Request 1, for the 2003 – 2006 M/Y Jeep Liberty vehicles (through January 30, 2006), are provided in Enclosure 2 – COMPLAINT DETAILS_OTHER VEHICLES.

23-13-01-04	30
23-13-01-05	52

The detailed response that lists the warranty claims information for 2003 – 2006 M/Y Jeep Liberty vehicles (through January 30, 2006), as requested in item 4 is provided in Enclosure 3 – WARRANTY DATA, as a Microsoft Access 2000 table, titled "WARRANTY DATA_OTHER VEHICLES".
The search criteria used by DCC to identify 2003 – 2006 M/Y Jeep Liberty vehicle (through January 30, 2006) claims for Request No. 4 can be found in the chart below:

Seatbelt, Buckle Half – Replace (Front Right)	23-13-01-04
Seatbelt, Buckle Half – Replace (Front Left)	23-13-01-05

11	Broken or Cracked
4R	Push Button Broken
61	Intermittent Operation
UC	Uncodeable

- Q10. DCC's PE response to Request No. 9 (Modifications or changes) requires clarification and additional information regarding Enclosure No. 10 (Change History, Confidential). Some of the information provided in the tables via the PDF documents, reference "TRWA," is not clear and does not provide all of the requested information. For each table, provide a clear and detailed description of the modification or change, a detailed reason for the modification or change, and the dates that the changes were incorporated into vehicle production. Acronyms, abbreviations, and other terms such as "grasshopper legs" should not be used in your response.**
- A10. A detailed summary of all pertinent buckle assembly design change information is being submitted as Enclosure 10 – CHANGE HISTORY, CONFIDENTIAL to the Office of the Chief Counsel, under separate cover with a request for confidential treatment.**
- Q11. Provide engineering drawings for all of the changes identified in Enclosure No. 10. The drawings should be clearly marked or otherwise annotated to reflect those changes.**
- A11. The drawings corresponding to all of the changes identified in Enclosure 10 – CHANGE HISTORY, CONFIDENTIAL are being submitted to the Office of the Chief Counsel, under separate cover with a request for confidential treatment.**
- Q12. Provide an exploded view drawing of the subject components identifying by name and part number all of its component parts. Separately, for each part, discuss its function in the operation of the buckle and its interaction with other buckle component parts.**
- A12. The detailed response that shows the buckle exploded view drawing, component part numbers, and component function / interaction is provided in Enclosure 7, titled "REQUEST NUMBER TWELVE DATA".**
- Q13. DCC's PE response to Request No. 2 states that all seven of the sample buckles that it had collected and analyzed had separated "latch guide leaf springs." Has DCC's analysis of those buckles identified the failure mechanism or what caused the latch guide leaf springs to break and separate?**
- A13. In addition to the 7 sample buckles reviewed for the PE response (4 warranty and 3 other), DCC has reviewed an additional 24 buckles from warranty with separated latch guide leaf springs. The SEM Analysis /**

Fractography Reports performed by DCC (reference Enclosure 5) indicate that the fractures of the button's latch guide leaf springs appear to emanate from similar origins near an inside corner, adjacent to the latch guide leaf spring leg. The corner may result in a stress riser that may affect latch guide leaf spring durability. DCC is not aware of any instances where fractured latch guide leaf springs have caused partial or false latching of the latchplate to the seat belt buckle.

High magnification images of intact and separated button latch guide leaf springs are shown in Enclosure 8, titled "INSIDE CORNERS AND FRACTURE".

Q14. ODI's analysis of the warranty and owner data indicates that 80% of the warranty claims on buckles and 90% of the owner reports are on early production vehicles produced in calendar year 2001. What is DCC's opinion as to why these vehicles are over represented?

A14. DCC believes the over representation of calendar year 2001 (2002 M/Y) vehicles is due primarily to the separation of button latch guide leaf springs, which may be traced to the differing inside corner radii.

The inside corners in the tooling were revised to a larger radius in early calendar year 2002 (2002 M/Y) to facilitate buckle assembly. The revision to the tooling appears to coincide with the cessation of warranty returns associated with separated latch guide leaf springs and customer complaints associated with the alleged condition in the subject vehicles. To date, DCC has not reviewed or been made aware of any driver or front passenger buckles produced after the tooling radii enlargement exhibiting separated latch guide leaf springs.

Even though the 2002 M/Y Jeep Liberty vehicles may be over-represented with regard to complaints of difficulties to latch, unlatch or the button sticking, there is no verified evidence that this condition causes any type of partial or false latching.

A high magnification image of the latch guide leaf spring area, produced after the tooling modification to enlarge the radii, is shown in Enclosure 9, titled "CORNER RADII".

Q15. In consideration of any additional information accumulated and evaluated in the preparation of DCC's response to this letter, furnish an update of DCC's assessment of the alleged defect in the subject vehicles, including:

- a. The causal or contributory factors;**
- b. The failure mechanism;**

- c. The failure mode;
- d. The risk to motor vehicle safety it poses; and
- e. The reports included with this letter.

A15. DCC has discussed potential causal factors, failure mechanism and failure mode in response to questions 13 and 14. However, based on the nature of the complaints and evaluation of related components, DCC does not believe this matter presents any unreasonable risk to motor vehicle safety.

The alleged defect as described in EA05-022 includes 3 different modes: false latching of the seat belt buckle, difficulty to latch, or difficulty to unlatch.

DCC is not aware of any confirmed incidents nor has reason to believe that the subject seat belt buckles have exhibited a false latching condition.

DCC has received a small number of customer complaints alleging a difficulty latching or unlatching the seatbelt in 2002 M/Y Jeep Liberty vehicles. DCC has tested and evaluated many of these buckles obtained via warranty, employee vehicle survey, and VOQ returns. All of the buckle assemblies were able to be fully latched and unlatched without compromise to the integrity of the latchplate engagement.

There are several factors that may contribute to difficulty latching and unlatching including but not limited to contamination and abuse. DCC also identified in some sample buckle assemblies that the latch guide leaf springs were fractured and/or separated. The latch guide leaf spring acts to aid the return of the button to the original position after latching or unlatching. A fractured and/or separated latch guide leaf spring does not prevent the full and complete engagement of the latchplate into the buckle.

DCC does not believe the level of the customer inputs associated with this inquiry is indicative of a safety defect. DCC draws comparisons to the recent General Motors 2000-2001 M/Y Cadillac Deville seatbelt investigation (PE04-060) with similar allegations. That investigation involved 20 complaints of seat belts unlatching in a crash, 13 legal claims / lawsuits and 16 alleged injuries and 2 fatalities.

This investigation involves a subject vehicle population of approximately 30,000 more units, but has no complaints of false latching, no lawsuits or alleged injuries. PE04-060 was closed by NHTSA on February 3, 2005 because NHTSA determined that a safety related defect trend was not identified and the further use of its resources was not warranted. DCC believes that the same conclusion should be reached here.