### Complaint Case Study

Bill Thomas Field Operations and Enforcement Division January 25, 2024



### **BAR Field Office Support**

😩 🕼 🗖 🛛 👷 Department of Consumer Affairs 🗙 👫 Contact Us - Bureau of Automoti X +		
← C බ ⊡ https://bar.ca.gov/co	ontact-us	
📡 DCA Intranet 🌓 httpbarnet-BarAp 🔝 Exp	ense Report Sol 🎢 Code Search 🧧 California Code of 🔝 CalTravelStore	© DCA Data and Rep
	Expense Report Solutions-CalATERS https://globalapp.sco.ca.gov/prod/applet/exc.jsp Consumers ▼ Licensees ▼ Industry ▼ Field Office Support BAR field offices provide support services to license applicants and licensees. Offices	Contact Us ♦ Settings     Information →     Online Services →     Search     Industry Help Desk   Inspection procedures, equipment, technical support BAR.IndustryHelpDesk@dca.ca.gov   (866) 860-8509
	or phone: <u>BARenforcement@dca.ca.gov</u> (279) 237-3570	

### **Complaint Background**

- Repair History:
  - o Fall 2022 Alternator replaced at first ARD
  - Spring 2023 Charge light illuminates
    - Second ARD recommended alternator to solve charge light
    - >Alternator replaced but light remained illuminated
    - Battery sensor replaced and harness connector repaired
  - $\circ$  Spring 2023 within days, light re-illuminates
    - Second ARD replaces wiring harness
  - $_{\odot}\text{Customer}$  files complaint with BAR in spring 2023

### **Complaint Investigation**

- Complaint filed against first ARD
- BAR representative reviews documentation from both ARDs
- BAR determined three separate repair transactions took place
- Multiple compliance concerns identified at both locations

### **First Repair Transaction**

- Alternator and starter replaced at first ARD
- Customer requested both due to no-start
- BAR determined ARD installed incorrect alternator
  - Manual transmission application installed on automatic transmission vehicle
  - Only difference is 'over-running' clutch on pulley for automatic transmission application
    - Clutch used to reduce noise, vibration, and harshness

### **Second Repair Transaction**

- Second ARD recommended alternator replacement due to incorrect application
- Upon replacement of alternator, ARD determined battery sensor was not generating correct signal
- Recommended sensor replacement
- Upon replacement of sensor, identified broken connector and attempted to repair
- Illuminated charge light was resolved by these repairs

### **Third Repair Transaction**

- Shortly after leaving second ARD, charge light re-illuminated
- Second ARD determined connector repair had failed and recommended harness replacement
- Customer authorized harness replacement
- Customer retrieved vehicle and paid more than \$2,300 for repairs

### BAR Findings – First Repair Transaction

- Customer requested first ARD provide a full refund of all monies spent at the second ARD
- Based upon BAR's determination that the incorrect alternator was installed, the first ARD offered to refund the amount spent (over \$500) on the alternator only
- Customer felt the refund amount was insufficient and declined the settlement offer

## BAR Findings – Second Repair Transaction (1 of 3)

 Review of the invoice from the second ARD displayed the statement, "voltage spikes from incorrect alternator caused battery sensor and harness failure"

Invoice did not list alternator test results

- Customer based their decision to decline the settlement offer from the first ARD based on this statement
- The statement by the second ARD negatively influenced the customer's ability to make an informed decision

# BAR Findings – Second Repair Transaction (2 of 3)

- During the complaint investigation, the BAR representative interviewed the second ARD's technician, who stated:
  - He performed the alternator replacement, battery sensor replacement, and attempted to repair the connector
  - During the connector repair, he determined the battery 'hold-down' was missing
    - He determined the missing hold-down was likely the cause of the sensor and connector failure
    - >This information was not listed on the technician's notes or invoice
  - The harness replacement was performed by another technician at the second ARD

# BAR Findings – Second Repair Transaction (3 of 3)

- BAR inspected the vehicle and determined the following:
  - $_{\odot}$  There was NOT an aftermarket hold-down, or any hold-down, on the vehicle
    - There was sufficient 'flex' in the harness to allow for battery movement without harness damage
    - BAR was unable to determine the condition and flex of the harness prior to replacement
  - $_{\odot}$  The correct alternator was now installed

There is no evidence that the alternator was defective other than the incorrect pulley application

 As a gesture of goodwill and due to the multiple false and misleading statements made by employees, the second ARD refunded the entire amount (over \$2,300) spent at their facility

### Moral of the Story

 BE COMPLETELY OPEN AND HONEST WITH CUSTOMERS, EVEN IF IT'S "BAD" NEWS!

#### **Contact Information**

#### Bill Thomas Bill.Thomas@dca.ca.gov

#### www.bar.ca.gov

