IN THE	COURT OF	COUNTY,
Petitioner/Plaintiff, V. Defendant/Respondent,)))))) (CAUS	E NO
CO	OMPLAINT WITH DISCOVERY	
, and preser	and Husband, and this their Complaint with Discove , showing as follows	ery as against the Defendants,
	I.	
The Plaintiffs,, are both a	and Husband, dult bona fide resident citizens of _	, known as County,
	II.	
business in the State of is a	a non-resident corporation register	ed to do business and doing
	III.	
The Defendant, to do business in the State of _ process is	, is a non-resident Del , whose reg which may be served at	laware corporation registered gistered Agent for service of
	lV.	
	non-resident Delaware corporation which may be served with	

V.

On	, 20	,	the	home of the Plaintiffs,	,
and Husband,			_, wa	s burned down in a fire that	t
erupted from the Ford F-150 truck belong	ging to			at a time when it was	5
parked and not running in the carport of th	e home	of the		causing the total	Ĺ
loss of the dwelling and the vehicle and all	of the co	ntents	in sam	ie.	
	T 7T				
France Abreau ab	VI.	4la a	Dad	San Jane	
From through	, l to moto	uieta a	Dei	endant, Smillion vehicles equipped with	-
() manufactured and sold a defective ignition switch supplied by Def					
Due to defective design, this switch produ	ices an	electri	al sho	ort resulting in the melting and	ı
ignition of flammable plastic components				9	
Thousands of vehicle fires have resulted fro					
			O		
	VII.				
and		lea	rned c	of the defective ignition no later	4
than the Fall of, and by,	had insti	tuted a	an exte	ensive redesign of the switch to	,
reduce the risk of fires.	and			nonetheless knowingly	r
and deliberately concealed this defect from	the moto	oring p	ublic a	and from responsible officials in	l
the National Highway Traffic Safety Ac					
mounting evidence of widespread fires resu					
vehicles. One of those recalls was that of th					
and correct copy of the Certificate of Titl					1
marked Exhibits 'A" and "B," respectively					-
hereof by and through incorporation by refe	rence, a	S II CO	piea ri	my nerem in words and rigures.	
	VIII.				
maid a alaima	fa., 4laa :	d	-! l	as as to the house and all of its	
contents, but the claim and the sums paid				es as to the house and all of its	
The subrogated thei					
anything which the insurance company					
and	to as	ssert al	l of th	eir losses and subrogation rights	3
and to recover sums lost as a result thereof.					
	IX.				
is one of the l	argest m	anufac	turers	of motor vehicles in the world.	
promotes and markets	_				
commitment to safety in their design and n					
motorists in the United States have pur					
	ole suppl	liers of	f comp	ponents for vehicles,	,
including the defective ignition switch.					

Due to modem technological advances, motor vehicles today are, for the most part, virtually "fire-safe" during ordinary and foreseeable vehicle operation, and the risk of that nature to a modern car or truck is very low. Consumers justifiably expect that motor vehicles purchased either new or used will not catch fire during their useful life.

XI.

Through intensive advertising h that its vehicles are reliable, safe and free from defects in motorists of media, and over a period of many years, motorists that in designing its vehicles "Quality I has run advertisements in national mag	nanufacturing or design. In a wide has represented the s Job One." In recent years
Is More Obsessed With Your Safety." From to conducted extensive advertising campaigns portraying	o vehicles as "The
Highest Quality American Cars and Trucks" or "The Best Bu	uilt Cars and Trucks in the World."
Since has run advertisements in magaz such as Motor Trend, describing Tough." Other advertising issued by	trucks as "Built
we look at way to improve our cars, safety alw also ran national advertising asserting	yays gets prime consideration." that it is a "Safety Leader." Copies
of the advertisements are attached hereto marked Exhibit "C, the terms of which are considered to be a part hereof by and as if copied fully in words and figures advertising.	through incorporation by reference,
XII.	
In reality and in sharp contradiction to the fored defective ignition switch installed on 26 million vehicles dangerous, unsafe and unacceptably susceptible to vehicle of the Plaintiff The ignition terminals attached to a plastic base together with flat copper these terminals, thereby completing various circuits. When position the slider moves across the positive "B+" terminal terminal powering the engine. In the defective switch in iss ground terminal are separated by an air gap and plastic parhundredths of an inch wide. Due to wear and tear and/or degelectrical short develops between the "B" terminal and the grant flammable, plastic components placed near the switch. An imotor is running or when it is turned off and the vehicle is defective switch installed on all vehicles subject to this desimilar, and such a defective switch was installed on the Plaintiff.	vehicles renders these of fires, and one of those was the switch consists of several copper sliders that move across the top of this switch is turned to the "Start" hal and connects with the ground ue here, the "B+" terminal and the rition that together are only a few gradation of the plastic partition, an round, thereby melting and igniting igniting may occur either when the unattended. (Emphasis added.) The defect is the same or substantially

XIII.

The defective ignition switch supplied by and installed by causes the vehicles containing this defect to suffer fires at rates far above the average for comparable vehicles.
XIV.

Beginning in, NHTSA made the defective ignition switch the subject of no less than four separate investigations, designated PE91-128, PE92-069, PE94-34 and PE94-078. The last of these investigations, PE94-078, was upgraded by NHTSA to an engineering evaluation, designated EA95-002. In, 20, to forestall a mandatory recall ordered by NHTSA, and undertook the largest automotive recall in the United States history, involving some 7.9 vehicles. Despite the size of this recall, it encompassed only a fraction of the 26 million Ford vehicles containing the defected ignition switch. It was too late for the vehicle of, which had already burned in the carport, burning the house down at a time when the vehicle's motor was not running, turned off and unattended.
XV.
and became aware of the ignition switch defect promptly after vehicles containing this defect reached the market, as a result of the dealers and from motorists who experienced fires. By Fall,, before had purchased his vehicle, and had received numerous reports of ignition switch fires, and were actively investigating these investigation quickly confirmed the existence of this defect and made aware of the specific respects in which this switch was defective. By, and instituted an extensive redesign of the defective switch for the express purpose of avoiding fires. Production and sale of vehicles containing the defective switch ceased in late or early
11 11
Despite there knowledge of the defective switch and concealed existence of this defect from the motoring public and from NHTSA, and withheld information concerning the defective switch from persons owning vehicles containing this defect. Moreover, even after learning of the defect, UTA continued to supply the defective switch to, and continued to manufacture and sell vehicles containing this known defect, for at least another four years. During this period while the defect was well known to the Defendants, neither nor disclosed the existence of the defect to the motorists purchasing the affected vehicles.

XVII.

In the numerous investigations that NHTSA instituted with respect to the defective switch, Defendants withheld information requested by this agency and made incomplete and misleading statements designed to mislead NHTSA into closing its investigations without taking

action. For example, written statements that Defendants submitted to NHTSA as part of its investigations in PE9l-128, PE92-069, PE94-034 and PE94-078 falsely asserted, as late as,, that there existed no common source or cause explaining the steering
column fires investigated by NHTSA. As shown by internal documents, the Defendants were well aware in making these statements that this assertion was false. Moreover, the Defendants falsely represented the NHTSA that their redesign of the ignition switch in
XVIII.
By means of their misleading and deceptive conduct, the Defendants knowingly and intentionally succeeded in concealing the facts giving rise to claims herein. Due to such concealment, Plaintiffs failed to discover their causes of action in a timely basis in the losses incurred. Defendants' actions constituted actual malice, or at a minimum gross negligence which evidences willful, wanton or reckless disregard for the safety of others and/or actual fraud giving rise to not just actual damages that the Plaintiffs are entitled to against the Defendants, but also punitive damages so as to punish the Defendants herein who are wrongdoers, and deter similar misconduct in the future by the Defendants and others in addition to the actual compensatory damages due to the Plaintiffs, just to make them hold.
XIX.
When a vehicle fire occurs, rarely, if ever, concedes that the fire resulted from a defect in its vehicle. Even when was forced to acknowledge that the ignition switch defect existed as a result of government and public pressure requiring a recall campaign, instructed its dealers to refer motorists complaining of fire to their insurer.
XX.
The vehicle of the Plaintiff, was defective because contained adequate warnings or instructions, and was designed in a defective manner and breached the express warranties of the manufacturer and the implied warranties of fitness and merchantability, and failed to conform to the express factual representations upon which the Plaintiffs justifiably relied in electing to purchase and use the motor vehicle, and the defective condition rendered the product unreasonably dangerous to the user and consumer, and more particularly to the Plaintiffs,, and this defective and unreasonably dangerous condition proximately caused the damages to the Plaintiffs for which the recovery is caught. The numerous vehicles sold

and particularly that of reduce the risk of the fire that did occur.	_ lacked warnings and instructions required to
Σ	XXI.
, lacked warnings and inst	ehicle sold and particularly that of the Plaintiff ructions required to reduce the risk of the fire that he absence of necessary warnings has obliged the
X	XXII.
ignition switch contained design and manufa Defendants also knew, or should have known instructions required to reduce the risk of fires	wn, that the vehicles equipped with the defective acturing defects likely as the results of the fire. own, that these vehicles lacked warnings and and the losses proximately stemming therefrom in manufacturing and distributing the affected
X	XIII.
both State Law and 49 U which they become aware that create an undue	old Defendants remain under a continuing SC Section 30118 to warn motorist of any defects e risk of injury or property damage. Defendants equipped with the defective ignition switch, and
X	XIV.
they claim herein, and more particularly the lo Plaintiff,, paid over	Plaintiffs have been obliged to suffer the losses ss of the house, the contents and the vehicle. The to the Plaintiffs, and, which did not cover all of their actual losses as
X	XXV.
Each vehicle is s	sold with the express written warranty issued by's warranty extends to each person ty is in effect.
o ,, and or reading the vehicle wille the wallall	J 10 111 C11CC1.

XXVI.

In this express warranty warrants that its vehicle is free from defects in design or manufacture of any kind, and it conforms in all applicable respects to industry standards and government regulations 's warranty includes a comprehensive "bumper to bumper" warranty, covering all the vehicles components and systems and extending for a defined number of years or miles driven by the vehicle, together
with additional, more specific warranties applicable to specified components or systems of the vehicle, such as the power train, in addition undertakes an additional expressed warranty through its advertising of promotional vehicles and by the authorized conduct of its dealers, including affirmations, promises and description of the vehicle that become part of the basis for bargain.
XXVII.
breached its express warranties with respect to the vehicle to by selling same in a defective condition likely to cause fires and by its failure to provide warnings and instructions required to reduce the risk of the fire that did occur, and is liable therefor.
XXVIII.
has been notified of and received an opportunity to cure its breach of express warranty, but has failed to do so. Second, as to any incident to which notice was not otherwise given, was put on notice as to the defects and breach of warranty complained of herein by the myriad of vehicle fires as to which notice was given. Finally in any event has long been aware of this defect and other breaches of warranty and has chosen to take no action to remedy them at least on a timely basis.
XXIX.
By reason of's breach of express warranties Plaintiffs have been obliged to pay the claims herein and suffer the losses described herein.
XXX.
By its conduct alleged above has violated the Federal Magnuson-Moss Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 2301 ETC and State Law, as codified in the in Section of the Code and Section of the being part of the
XXXI.
The Plaintiffs repeat has breached implied warranties imposed by law that are applicable to its vehicles, in particular the vehicle of, including the implied warranty of merchantability and implied warranty of fitness for a particular purpose pursuant of Sections and of the

XXXII.

is a merchant as to its motor vehicles. Pursuant to the implied
warranty of merchantability covering the sale of this vehicle warrants
without limitations that this vehicle is fit for the ordinary purpose for which they are sold,
conformed to affirmations mainly in labeling and sales literature, and are freed from defects so
as to pass without objection in the trade.
XXXIII.
When placing the vehicle of in the stream of commerce
When placing the vehicle of in the stream of commerce was well aware that when acquiring this vehicle
expected it to be safe and free from defects in its ordinary foreseeable operation, but the facts
give rise to an implied warranty of fitness for a particular purpose with respect to's vehicle.
XXXIV.
has breached the implied warranties applicable to this vehicle by
selling or leasing the vehicle in a defective condition likely to cause the fire that did occur and
makes the failure to provide the warnings and instructions required to reduce the fire thus
proximately causing the damages and losses herein.
DAMAGES
XXXV.
The Plaintiffs suffered a loss of household goods, furnishings, appliances and all matters
therein of \$, as a result of the fire proximately caused by the vehicle
manufactured by the Defendant,, and were compensated by the
Co-Plaintiff,, for the contents of \$, being the policy limits
of and husband also had a reduction therein of
of and husband,, also had a reduction therein of \$, for the deductible. The Plaintiffs, and husband,
, suffered a loss in actual damages for which they should be compensated
by the Defendants of \$ The Plaintiff,, has suffered damages
proximately caused by the burning of the vehicle manufactured by the Defendant in the amount
of \$, for the dwelling and \$, for the contents for a total of \$,
that the Defendants should be required to pay the Plaintiff The Plaintiffs,
and husband,, were dispossessed of their home for quite a considerable period of time and suffered extreme emotional anguish and distress, and for
that reason and the reasons given above they should be awarded punitive damages in the amount
of \$ being one hundred times the value of their actual losses, plus reasonable
attorney's fees.
DISCOVERY
Pursuant to the terms and provisions of the Rules of Civil Procedure the
Plaintiff propounds unto the Defendant the following Discovery in the form of Interrogatories,
Requests for Production and Requests for Admissions, all of which must be answered under oath

within thirty (30) days from the date hereof or as to the Requests for Admissions be deemed answered or responded to:

INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NUMBER 1: Please identify by name and address all persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter not privileged which is relevant to the issues raised by the Complaint and any subsequent Defenses, Answer or Responsive pleadings which may be filed hereafter by the Defendant or by the Plaintiff.

Respectfully submitted,