



6th December 2016

# SUBMISSION

for

## Consumer Affairs Australia and New Zealand

### HOW THE AUSTRALIAN CONSUMER LAW IS WORKING (OR ISN'T) AND HOW IT CAN BE IMPROVED



[lemonlaws4aus@gmail.com](mailto:lemonlaws4aus@gmail.com)

# Introduction

Lemon Laws 4 Aus (LL4A) is a lobby group founded by Connie Cicchini. The lobby group was established because of Ms Cicchini's and many other car owners' frustrations trying to get a remedy of repair, replacement or refund for a new motor vehicle with major problems.

Even though products sold within Australia are required to be of 'merchantable quality' or 'acceptable quality' these terms and definitions within the previous *Trade Practices Act (TPA)* and current *Australian Consumer Laws (ACL)* are regularly disputed between the supplier and the customer. Because of the lack of clear definitions for these terms related to 'quality', it is either difficult or impossible for many consumers who acquired a problematic new motor vehicle to get a refund or a replacement.

## What is a 'lemon'?

The definition of a '*lemon*' is a car (often new) that is found to be defective only after its purchase. Any motor vehicle with numerous, severe defects that reoccur after multiple repair attempts is such and the term 'lemon' can also extend to any product with flaws too great or severe to serve its purpose.

## Consumer experiences

Ms Cicchini purchased a brand new Alfa Romeo 147 in 2009. During the three year manufacturer's warranty period the vehicle had been back to the dealership approximately twenty times and had spent over 160 days in the workshop.

Ms Cicchini had made numerous calls and had sent hundreds of emails to the dealership. She had even sent emails to the importer, manufacturer in Italy and the International CEO of Fiat Chrysler Automobiles in attempts to get a satisfactory resolution.

After receiving an extended one year manufacturer's warranty, it was apparent that the Alfa Romeo 147 could not be repaired as some issues present during the original warranty period were still present when the extended manufacturer's warranty had expired.

As the Dealership would not refund or replace the vehicle, Ms Cicchini had no option but take the matter further. She was not in a financial position to take up a costly legal battle through the Queensland Courts so instead lodged a complaint against the Dealership with the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal (QCAT) in May 2013.

The associated costs to purchase the vehicle was approximately \$40,000 and Ms Cicchini had to reduce her claim to \$25,000 so the matter could be heard within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal. The matter had been going backwards and forwards at QCAT for over two years and had continued to burden Ms Cicchini both financially and emotionally especially when she had to also appeal a decision. The appeal process found the Adjudicator had erred in referring to the *ACL* rather than the *TPA*. The vehicle was purchased in 2009 so the *Trade Practices Act* was the relevant applicable legislation for this particular dispute.

In the outcome of recent investigations by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) into consumer guarantee complaints, vehicle faults and the inadequate handling of customer complaints by Fiat Chrysler Automobiles (FCA) and its dealerships (**Ref: Attachment 1**) it is apparent that there is a necessity for laws to better protect the Australian Consumer.

Volkswagen Group (VWG) is currently under investigation by the ACCC for the potential consumer and competition detriment from their alleged conduct for possible use of 'defeat devices' in Australia (**Ref: Attachment 2**).

It is important to note that Consumer Guarantee concerns are not limited only to vehicles supplied by FCA and VWG. Lemon Laws 4 Aus has received numerous complaints and comments via their social media page from disgruntled consumers who have purchased other makes of vehicles that have turned out to be problematic and who have not received a satisfactory resolution under the *Australian Consumer Guarantees* or *Statutory Warranties*.

There are also a number of other social media pages dedicated to consumer concerns such as *Destroy My Jeep, Lemon Vehicles in Aus, Lemon Caravans in Aus, Fix our Ford Focus & Fiestas!!*, *Destroy My Ford*, *VW Issues Australia*, *My Holden Captiva is Crap*, *My Audi is a Lemon*, *Teggy - I Made a Mistake I Bought a Lemon*, *Tank My Lemon* and *John Cadogan (Auto Expert)* which report and/or comment on their experiences with the motor industry and faulty new cars.

## Impacts on the consumer

It is important to consider the impacts emotional and financial stress has on the consumer and the flow on effects to their families, friends, community, to the health and legal systems when a consumer is not able to achieve a quick and efficient remedy from the supplier. In some instances the additional stress of trying to get a car fixed, repaired or replaced can greatly impact on a consumer's well-being and state of mind. This was the case when Jamie Peter Ripley tried to have his new motor vehicle repaired under warranty and the dealership refused. Mr Ripley was so disgruntled that he planted pipe bombs at the Gold Coast dealership. Mr Ripley was then sentenced to three years jail in March 2015 (*Ref: Attachment 3*).

When a consumer decides not to burden themselves with unnecessary stress and chooses to instead sell or trade out of an unsafe, unreliable lemon vehicle, in many instances it is the consumer, not the supplier, who will incur a financial loss from this exchange.

Unfortunately when lemon vehicles are then presented into the second hand market this can then create a 'domino' effect. If these lemon vehicles are never successfully repaired during the manufacturer's warranty period then these lemon vehicles will become an emotional and financial burden on the next unsuspecting purchaser. This vehicle will then be on sold or traded in again to the next unsuspecting consumer.

This raises more serious concerns over safety and who is ultimately liable should that lemon vehicle fault and cause serious injury or death.

## Available remedies

A motor vehicle in many instances will be the most expensive purchase a consumer will make after a home. As a vehicle is a major and necessary purchase for many consumers and it is important that should a supplier not provide the necessary *Consumer Guarantee* that a consumer can then access affordable justice.

It is beyond the means of many consumers to have the time and money available to take on legal representation against a well-funded supplier in the Queensland Courts. An affordable option in the State of Queensland for example is to contact the Office of Fair Trading (OFT) so they can attempt to mediate with the supplier. If mediation through the OFT is unsuccessful then a complaint can be lodged with the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal (QCAT) and has a claim limit of \$25,000 for minor civil disputes. The purchase price of a new car in many instances is more than \$25,000 thus pursuing many lemon car matters through QCAT is not a solution for many consumers.

## Improving consumer protections

Legislation or a contract/purchase agreement should be protect both the supplier and the consumer.

Fair terms ought to be mandated to provide a level of protection to the consumer beyond the basic warranty rights that exist. In many circumstances this offers little comfort when vehicles present themselves with latent defects.

Legislative protections and remedies could be improved by:

1. Introducing 'Lemon Laws' which clearly define the term 'acceptable quality', enhance the *Consumer Guarantees* and provide mandatory time and repair limits eg:

The acquired new vehicle will be deemed to be of acceptable quality if the motor vehicle has not been presented by the Consumer to the Supplier within the first twenty-four (24) months from date of purchase for the following:

- a) Two (2) events for safety related non-scheduled repair issues, or
- b) A total of four (4) accumulated events for non-scheduled repair issues, or
- c) Has spent a total of twenty (20) accrued days for repair

(For additional suggestions for defining 'acceptable quality' and enhancing consumer guarantees ref: Attachment 4)

2. Alternatively a new car purchase agreements/contracts could be mandated to include additional comfort for the consumer. The attached *Defined Acceptable Quality and Enhanced Consumer Guarantee Clauses Annexure (Ref: Attachment 4)* could be made available by government so as to provide additional protection for the consumer when purchasing a new motor vehicle

in Australia. The clauses from this Annexure could also be included into the Australian Consumer Laws to further their enhancement.

3. Provide increased protection for dealerships, by including the same definitions to 'acceptable quality' and enhanced guarantees to apply to manufacturers and distributors supplying new vehicles.
4. Make justice easily accessible and affordable for consumers by removing any monetary limits at Administrative Tribunal or the like that may be set in Australian States and Territories for consumer disputes matters.
5. To make mediation more efficient, Government could provide a *Motor Vehicle Dispute Resolution Form* which lists how and when the 'consumer guarantees' or 'acceptable quality' have not been met. This would not only assist the consumer, it would also benefit dealerships and any parties involved in the mediation process when making claims for redress (**Refer attachment 5**).
6. Implement a 'Lemon Register' so that when a problematic new car has been replaced or refunded that this information is available to all potential buyers.
7. Manufacturers and distributors to provide extended manufacturers warranties for any vehicle deemed to be a lemon and for any vehicles that have been recalled.
8. Introduction of a motor industry-based consumer dispute resolution scheme or a Motor Vehicles and Automotive Services Ombudsman to resolve disputes between consumers and the motor industry.
9. State and Federal Governments to implement business and consumer awareness programs to further educate the community on the Australian Consumer Laws and the Consumer Guarantees.

## How many consumers are impacted by faulty new vehicles?

A recent survey released by Choice Survey (**Ref: Attachment 5**) on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2016 found that:

- *66% of new car buyers faced problems with their new cars in the first five years of owning them.*
- *Half (52%) of all new car buyers experienced minor problems.*
- *14% faced a major problem (one that either seriously impaired the car's operation or outright stopped it working) or a combination of major and minor problems.*

Considering that approximately 1.1 million new cars are sold in Australia per annum then these percentages quoted by Choice would translate roughly as follows:

- 726,000 new car buyers would have faced problems with their new cars in the first five years of owning them.
- 572,000 of those new car buyers experienced minor problems.
- 154,000 Australian Consumers faced a major problem (one that either seriously impaired the car's operation or outright stopped it working) or a combination of major and minor problems.

Since the release of the Choice report a class action has been launched by Bannister Law on behalf of about 60,000 Australian Ford owners, claiming a number of Fiesta, Focus and EcoSport models containing an automatic "PowerShift" transmission are potentially dangerous (**Ref: Attachment 7**). The class action alleges these models are not safe, fail to comply with the Australian Consumer law, and have a clear pattern of problems such as drivers experiencing sudden acceleration, delay in downshifts, delayed acceleration, and difficulties in stopping when braking.

The social media page '*Fix our Ford Focus & Fiestas!!*' have had a number of owners commenting about having had transmissions replaced multiple times, Some owners have been known to have had the transmission replaced seven and eight times. Only a few owners have been successful in getting refunds and found it difficult, time consuming and emotionally stressful for them to finally achieve this outcome. Many more owners though are finding it impossible to get a refund or a replacement of their faulty vehicles.

## Lemon Cars an issue for many State Governments

The Victorian Government in 2006 made a commitment to introduce lemon laws for motor vehicle and other major product purchases.

*“The Government is aware that purchases of defective motor vehicles and household products do occur and consumers suffer as a result of those purchases, in particular from being unable to receive adequate redress for the purchase.” (Issues Paper Introducing Victorian motor vehicle lemon laws 2006 - Consumer Affairs Victoria).*

In 2015 the Queensland Government released its report from its public hearing on 'Lemon' Laws - Inquiry into consumer protections and remedies for buyers of new motor vehicles - Report No. 17, 55th Parliament Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee November 2015'.

One of many recommendation from this report stated:

*‘The committee recommends that the government appropriately amend existing Queensland legislation to ensure effective implementation of the committee’s recommendations included in this report, but do so as part of any national approach to ‘lemon’ laws for new motor vehicles in Australia.’*

It is now ten years on from the Consumer Affairs Victoria Lemon Laws Issues paper. There were issues reported of consumers having difficulties with getting remedies and many unable to get any remedy at all under the Trade Practices Act. Even after the introduction of the Australian Consumer Laws consumers are still reporting difficulties with getting remedies and many still are unable to get any remedy at all.

Even with the intervention of the ACCC, many FCA consumers are struggling to get adequate redress via the FCA Customer Redress Program. It had been reported by John Rolfe, the Public Defender for the Daily Telegraph that consumers in the FCA Customer Redress Program are being short changed (*Ref: Attachment 9*). Concerns have also been raised to the ACCC that the Independent Reviewer for this program has represented the motor industry and may not necessarily be the best person to represent consumers who have already been struggling with the mindset of the motor industry. A panel of reviewers from various backgrounds (including at least one reviewer who has a consumer minded approach) may provide more suitable remedies for these consumers who are in the FCA Customer Redress Program or another similar program that may be implemented in the future for other consumers who may be struggling to get remedies from dealerships or manufacturers.

## CCAAC’s recommendation in 2009 to reconsider the need for a Lemon Law

In October 2009 the Commonwealth Consumer Affairs Advisory Council formed an opinion that the new Australian Consumer Law would be adequate protection for the consumer so they could more easily get remedies for faulty new cars and thus a provision for Lemon Laws was not required. Unfortunately this was not the case as complaints to the ACCC had been significant enough to have led to investigations and a study into the motor industry.

In the CCAAC’s *“Consumer Rights – Reforming statutory implied conditions and warranties, Final Report 2009”* it stated that:

*“Further, CCAAC believes that the introduction of consumer guarantees as statutory rights independent of the law of contract — as well as a move away from the somewhat archaic language of the current TPA provisions — will provide much-needed clarity for consumers dealing with motor vehicle lemons. Nevertheless, it may emerge that problems with motor vehicle lemons persist after the introduction of a new, clearer consumer guarantee regime. If evidence emerges over time to indicate that consumers continue to suffer as a result of the supply of motor vehicle lemons notwithstanding clarification of the law, it may be appropriate to reconsider the need for a lemon law at that time.”*

Even though the ACL may have provided more clarity for the consumer it is apparent many in the motor industry are struggling to understand the ACL. The ACCC receives about 14,000 complaints of misleading and deceptive conduct from consumers (*ref: Attachment 8*). The ACCC can take only a small number of complaints to court. From the volume of complaints made by consumers to the ACCC in relation to problematic vehicles it is obvious many in the motor industry may need further assistance to distinguish the differences between ‘minor problems’ and ‘major problems’ or alternatively are simply

oblivious of the Consumer Guarantees or ignoring them. By including a provision for Lemon Laws in the ACL, educating the motor industry about the legislation and the strict enforcement of the ACL will ensure that redress can come more quickly for the consumer and help lessen the burden of already under resourced and over loaded Courts, Fair Trading Offices, Tribunals and the ACCC.

## Summary

It is apparent that more than just a handful of consumers have been effected by faulty new vehicles and far too many consumers are finding it impossible to get a refund or a replacement for a vehicle that is unsafe, has major problems or not easily repaired. No Australian consumer should have to suffer any financial and/or emotional hardship if they have inadvertently ended up purchasing a product that is majorly flawed. That is why it is imperative to include in the amendment of the Australian Consumer Laws clearer definitions of 'Acceptable Quality' for Motor Vehicles and enhance the 'Consumer Guarantees' (AKA Motor Vehicle Lemon Laws) to further protect Australian Consumers.



### Connie Cicchini

Lemon Laws 4 Aus

P: 0413 625 225

E: lemonlaws4aus@gmail.com

# REFERENCES:

## ATTACHMENT 1

**Source:**  
<https://www.accc.gov.au/media-release/chrysler-undertakes-to-remedy-customer-service-complaints-following-accc-investigation>

# Chrysler undertakes to remedy customer service complaints following ACCC investigation

11 September 2015

Fiat Chrysler Australia (Chrysler) has provided an administrative undertaking to the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, following an investigation into consumer guarantee complaints concerning vehicle faults and Chrysler's handling of those complaints.

Chrysler's undertaking includes a commitment to establish a consumer redress program, and to review its handling of previous complaints, as well as an Australian Consumer Law (ACL) compliance program which includes a complaints handling system.

Chrysler distributes several vehicle brands in Australia including Jeep, Alfa Romeo, Fiat and Chrysler.

The ACCC received a number of complaints from Chrysler customers concerning vehicle faults and how their complaints were handled by Chrysler and its dealers. The complaints related to various issues including delays in sourcing spare parts and failing to adequately deal with customer complaints.

Chrysler has acknowledged the ACCC's concerns and cooperated with the investigation. Chrysler has advised the ACCC that it has taken a number of steps to improve its aftersales care, particularly complaint handling, to address these concerns.

"The consumer guarantees mandate that vehicles will be fit for purpose, free from defects and as durable as a reasonable consumer would expect. Where the guarantee is not complied with, a consumer will have rights against the supplier and in some cases the manufacturer, who will have to provide a remedy," ACCC Chairman Rod Sims said.

"This means that all car manufacturers and suppliers, including dealers, need to think beyond the initial sale and invest in their aftersales care."

Chrysler's administrative undertaking includes a process where particular affected Chrysler customers can agree to have their previous complaints independently reviewed, with Chrysler committing to implement the remedy recommended by the independent reviewer.

The ACCC is pleased that this program will be available for these customers and will monitor its implementation.

"The ACCC is considering concerns about the motor vehicle industry more generally, with a particular focus on ensuring compliance with the consumer guarantee provisions of the consumer law." Mr Sims said.

## Background

### Consumer Redress Program

Under the consumer redress program, Chrysler will:

- identify and contact customers who made a complaint to Chrysler about vehicle issues between the period 1 January 2013 and 31 December 2014, and who were refused a particular remedy by Chrysler (other than those customers whose complaints were resolved to their satisfaction or were resolved in a Court or Tribunal);
- offer to have an independent person review their complaint to determine whether the outcome was in accordance with ACL or *Trade Practices Act 1974* (TPA) consumer rights; and
- where a review is conducted and it is determined that the outcome was not in accordance with ACL or TPA consumer rights, provide or procure that a dealer provide a remedy on Chrysler's behalf as recommended by the independent reviewer, which is consistent with those rights.

Affected customers who are not contacted by Chrysler within 60 days should contact Chrysler's Customer Care Assistance Centre on 1300 133 079.

Chrysler will report to the ACCC on the number of reviews undertaken and the outcomes reached.

### Consumer guarantees under the ACL

The ACL has introduced a regime of consumer guarantees that applies to products and services bought after 1 January 2011. In relation to motor vehicles, manufacturers and suppliers including dealers, have obligations under these consumer guarantees.

When the problem is minor, the supplier can choose between providing a repair or offering the consumer a replacement or a refund. When there is a major failure, the consumer can reject the vehicle and either choose a refund or a replacement. Consumers can also seek compensation from suppliers or manufacturers. More information is available on the ACCC's website at: [Motor vehicle sales & repairs - an industry guide to the Australian Consumer Law](#).

For products and services bought before 1 January 2011, consumers may still have rights under previous consumer protection laws in the *Trade Practices Act 1974*.

Release number: MR 174/15 - Media enquiries: Media team - 1300 138 917

**Source:**

<https://www.accc.gov.au/media-release/accc-update-on-vw-enforcement-investigation>

## ACCC update on VW enforcement investigation

---

1 October 2015

The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission is today providing an update on its investigation into Volkswagen Group (VW) for possible use of 'defeat devices' in Australia, following significant public interest.

Defeat devices can be used to make vehicles perform better in testing than in real world operations.

"This enforcement investigation is a priority for the ACCC. We are very concerned about the potential consumer and competition detriment from this alleged conduct," ACCC Chairman Rod Sims said.

"First, using defeat devices is specifically prohibited under the Australian Design Rules, which are picked up as Australian Consumer Law (ACL) mandatory safety standards."

"As the enforcer of the ACL, the ACCC can take action against any corporation that has breached mandatory standards," Mr Sims said.

"Secondly, cars are a big purchasing decision and claims that relate to environmental benefits or fuel efficiency can influence consumer choice."

"Businesses must be able to substantiate any claims they make. The ACCC will be seeking marketing materials from VW Group and will not hesitate to take action if consumers were exposed to false, misleading or deceptive representations," Mr Sims said.

The maximum penalty per breach of the ACL is \$1.1 million for a corporation.

VW Australia is yet to clarify if it has supplied cars or car components into the Australian market that use defeat devices.

The ACCC is considering public comments made by Audi Australia on how their Australian customers are affected.

The ACCC continues to work closely with the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development to determine the impact on Australian consumers.

Release number:

MR 187/15

Media enquiries:

Media team - 1300 138 917



Source:

<http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/queensland/man-jailed-for-trying-to-blow-up-car-dealership-20150317-1m10o9.html>

1:24PM Wednesday Oct 7, 2015 2655 online now Do you know more about a story? Real Estate

MY NEWS MY CLIPPINGS MY COMMENTS

**brisbanetimes**  
.com.au

# Queensland

Queensland Brisbane Live Brisbane Traffic About Town

You are here: Home > Queensland News >

## Man jailed for trying to blow up car dealership

March 17, 2015 ★ Read later

[Tweeet](#) 3 [Share](#) 257 [G+ Share](#) 1 [in Share](#) [Pin it](#) [submit](#)

[Email article](#) [Print](#)



A man who planted bombs at a Gold Coast car dealership has been jailed for three years. *Photo: Louie Douvis*

A man has been jailed for trying to blow up a Gold Coast car dealership because they wouldn't fix his car under warranty.

Jamie Peter Ripley, 38, planted the three explosives in mid-2013.

Two of the pipe bombs were found at the Robina car lot, while the third was in a car that had been driven between the dealership and a mechanic workshop.

Ripley has pleaded guilty in the District Court in Southport to offences including attempting to destroy property by explosives, and not having authority to possess explosives.

He was sentenced on Tuesday to three years' jail, and will be eligible for parole after six months.

**AAP**

# Defined Acceptable Quality and Enhanced Consumer Guarantee Clauses

by Connie Cicchini in conjunction with Ashton Wood and Stewart Lette

## ANNEXURE

### To Contract/Purchase Agreement for the Acquisition of a New Motor Vehicle

This Annexure does not contract out the legislated rights of the consumer under the Australian Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Australian Consumer Laws) and is included in this Contract/Purchase Agreement to enhance the Australian Consumer Law (Schedule 2), Specific Protections (Chapter 3), Consumer Guarantee (Section 54), Guarantee as to acceptable quality.

Both the Dealership and the Purchaser/s agree:

1. The acquired new vehicle will be deemed to be of acceptable quality if the motor vehicle has not been presented by the Purchaser/s to the Dealership within the first twenty-four (24) months from date of purchase for the following:
  - a. Two (2) events for safety related non-scheduled repair issues, or
  - b. A total of four (4) accumulated events for non-scheduled repair issues, or
  - c. Has spent a total of twenty (20) accrued days for repair
2. If within the first twelve (12) months from the date of purchase the motor vehicle is not of acceptable quality, then the Purchaser/s can request from the Dealership the choice of a replacement of a like for like new vehicle, or a full refund of the purchase price, including any costs incurred by the Purchaser/s regarding any financial arrangement associated with the purchase of the motor vehicle.
3. If within the first twenty-four (24) months from the date of purchase the motor vehicle is not of acceptable quality, then the Purchaser/s has the choice to request from the Dealership a replacement like for like used vehicle, or a refund of the purchase price prorated from the date the vehicle was first presented to the Dealership for non-scheduled repairs. In addition to such refund the Purchaser will be entitled to be refunded any costs incurred by the Purchaser/s regarding any financial arrangement associated with the purchase of the motor vehicle calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$$R = A - [(B \div C) \times 100 = D]$$

*R* is the refund payable to the Purchaser/s

*A* means the price paid for the vehicle and includes on road costs, delivery costs, tax imposed and other options costs on the vehicle at the point of sale.

*B* means from delivery to the Purchaser/s the kilometres travelled by the vehicle when it was first returned to the Dealership for correction of a problem.

*C* means the total of 200,000 kilometres being an average of distance travelled over ten year life of vehicle.

*D* means the percentage of use of vehicle distance travelled.

4. Within the warranty period, cosmetic defects which do not affect the functionality are excluded from clause (1), and this clause does not remove any of the legislated rights the Consumer (the Purchaser/s in this instance) has from the Australian Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Australian Consumer Laws) should the cosmetic defect not be repaired by the Dealership.
5. Subject to clause (1) hereof In the event the motor vehicle is not of acceptable quality, the Dealership will provide to the Purchaser/s the choice of the relevant applicable refund within ten (10) working days, or the relevant applicable replacement motor vehicle within twenty (20) working days from written notification by the Purchaser/s to the Dealership advising that the new motor vehicle is not of acceptable quality.
6. The Dealership will, in the event of either a transmission or engine fault and/or failure within the first twelve (12) months of the date of purchase of the vehicle, replace entirely the faulted and/or failed transmission or engine within one (1) month of the vehicle being presented with such fault.
7. In the event the transmission or engine faults or fails after the first twelve (12) months from the purchase date of the vehicle, the Dealership will repair any faults or failure of the transmission or engine for the first two hundred thousand kilometres (200,000) or ten (10) years, whichever is the sooner.
8. The Dealership, on request from the Purchaser/s, will provide for use at no charge to the Purchaser/s an equivalent courtesy motor vehicle or hire car in the event that the acquired motor vehicle has been presented to the Dealership for non-scheduled repair works.
9. The Dealership will, if requested by the Purchaser/s, provide scheduled servicing and non-scheduled repairs during the course of the new motor vehicle's Manufacturer Warranty Period.
10. The Dealership will, on completion of any investigations, servicing or repair works, provide to the Purchaser/s service documentation stating type of investigations and/or service and/or non-scheduled repairs and how the Dealership has rectified these works and/or provide diagnostic results if repairs have not been able to be carried out.
11. The Purchaser/s is required to adhere to the motor vehicle's service scheduling, give or take (whichever is the sooner) two thousand, five hundred (2,500) kilometres or eight (8) weeks either side of any scheduled services so as not to void the Manufacturer's Warranty.

PURCHASER'S NAME (1)	SIGNATURE	____/____/____ DATE
PURCHASER'S NAME (2)	SIGNATURE	____/____/____ DATE
DEALERSHIP	SIGNATURE	____/____/____ DATE

**THIS SIGNED ANNEXURE MUST BE ATTACHED TO BOTH THE PURCHASER/S AND DEALERSHIP'S COPY OF THE CONTRACT/PURCHASE AGREEMENT AND BOTH COPIES OF THE CONTRACT/PURCHASE AGREEMENT MUST INCLUDE THE WORDING 'SEE ATTACHED ANNEXURE'.**

**IT IS RECOMMENDED THE PURCHASER/S TO FIRST OBTAIN LEGAL ADVICE BEFORE SIGNING ANY CONTRACT OR AGREEMENT.**

This document may be reproduced and published in whole or in part for non-commercial purposes and cannot be reproduced for commercial gain without the prior written consent of Lemon Laws 4 Aus. ©Lemon Laws 4 Aus. 2015

## MOTOR VEHICLE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FORM

Purchaser's Name		
Address		
Contact number	Home	Mobile
Email Address		

Make of Vehicle		
Model of Vehicle		
Rego Number	VIN Number	
Purchase Date	Odometer Reading	klms

Dealership		
Address		
Contact number		
Email address		

How many issues have you had with this vehicle?	
IN THE BELOW QUESTIONS PLEASE CIRCLE IF YOU HAVE CONTACTED EITHER THE DEALERSHIP AND/OR THE MANUFACTURER	
Have you contacted the Dealership/Manufacturer to organise repairs?	YES / NO
Has the Dealership/Manufacturer repaired the vehicle?	YES / NO
At any time did you request from the Dealership/Manufacturer to either replace the vehicle or refund your money for the purchase of the vehicle? (attach documentation)	YES / NO
Did the Dealership/Manufacturer refund or replace your vehicle when requested?	YES / NO
If the Dealership/Manufacturer did not replace your vehicle or refund your money what were their reasons not to do so?	

**DETAILS OF ISSUES WITH THE NEW MOTOR VEHICLE ACQUIRED**  
(provide documentation)

Date	Issue reported	Number of Days in Workshop	Issue resolved Y/N

## ATTACHMENT 6

Source:

<https://www.choice.com.au/transport/cars/general/articles/lemon-cars-and-consumer-law>

## ATTACHMENT 7

Source:

<http://mobile.abc.net.au/news/2016-05-18/ford-faces-class-action-over-powershift-automatic-transmission/7425098>

5/25/2016 Ford faces class action over potentially dangerous transmission used in some Fiesta, Focus models - ABC News (Australian Broadcasting Corpora...

NEWS HOME

### Ford faces class action over potentially dangerous transmission used in some Fiesta, Focus models

BY THE NATIONAL REPORTING TEAM'S JOSIE TAYLOR

UPDATED WED 18 MAY 2016, 3:44 PM AEST



PHOTO Kelly Richards believes the transmission caused an engine fire that destroyed her Fiesta. SUPPLIED

A law firm has launched a class action on behalf of about 60,000 Australian Ford owners, claiming vehicles containing an automatic "PowerShift" transmission are potentially dangerous.

The law suit alleges the six-speed, double-clutch transmission used in some Fiesta, Focus and EcoSport models is not safe, fails to comply with Australian consumer law, and has had a clear pattern of problems.

The claim alleges some drivers have experienced sudden acceleration, delay in downshifts, delayed acceleration, and difficulty in stopping whilst braking.

Manual vehicles are not part of the lawsuit.

One Ford Fiesta owner Kelly Richards, who is part of the class action, believes the transmission on her car caused an engine fire that destroyed the vehicle.

**Do you know more about this story? Email [investigations@abc.net.au](mailto:investigations@abc.net.au)**

"It wasn't driving properly and shuddering when accelerating. An independent mechanic identified the transmission as the problem," Ms Richards said.

"Then my father-in-law was taking a short trip when the engine began to smoke. Quite quickly, the entire front of the car was engulfed in flames. It was a frightening experience and the car was a write-off."

The law firm said it had nearly 2,000 car owners already registered in the class action.

"We're asking the court to consider ordering a full refund for the purchase price, a range of damages ensuing from repair costs and out-of-pocket expenses, and aggravated damages," principal of Bannister Law, Charles Bannister said.

Ford Australia said it had not received any legal documents and would not comment on pending litigation in any case.

POSTED WED 18 MAY 2016, 1:01 PM AEST

Source:

<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/opinion/companies-that-tell-us-lies-in-false-advertising-must-be-hit-by-tougher-penalties/news-story/a415212e49bd99de0d47cfa25c393d0c>

[Subscribe](#) [Login](#)

**80% off for the first 2 months. ▶**

# Companies that tell us lies in false advertising must be hit by tougher penalties

November 27, 2016 9:00pm  
 ANDREW LEIGH



Dulux is not the first company to be caught over false advertising here.

WHEN it comes to household brands, who do you trust? That's the question Australians were asked earlier this year as part of a Reader's Digest survey. The top three were vacuum cleaner manufacturer Dyson and battery makers Energizer and Duracell. But what's interesting is who came in at No.4: paint manufacturer Dulux.

Unfortunately, Dulux's time on the trust list might be short-lived. Earlier this month, the company was fined \$400,000 by the Federal Court for misleading its customers. Dulux claimed its outdoor paint could reduce the temperature of a house by up to 10C.

If true, Dulux's outdoor paint would have been a cool product indeed. Unfortunately, as soon as the temperature rose on Dulux, their claims began to peel away.

When they couldn't brush off the criticisms any longer, the company admitted that it didn't have the evidence.

Alas, Dulux is not the first company to be caught over false advertising here. Every year, the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission receives 14,000 complaints of misleading and deceptive conduct. The competition watchdog can take only a small share of those complaints to court.

The list of companies that have been reprimanded by the competition watchdog or the Federal Court over the past 12 months reads like the "who's who" of big names, including Jetstar, Virgin, Arnott's, Uncle Tobys, Optus, Harvey Norman franchisees, Kogan, Nurofen, Unilever and Volkswagen.

False claims aren't just a casual annoyance, they also damage our economy. I estimate that the companies that were found to have misled and deceived consumers last year operate in industries with more than \$200 billion of revenues annually. That is a sizeable chunk of the Australian economy.

MDM GROUP FOR SALE



THE IDEAL INVESTMENT FOR UNDER \$1,600,000

ADVERTISEMENT



Why I no longer fear anxiety



The deadly summer danger we ignore



The MCG's most memorable moments



Tigers' failure mourned - and mocked



Melbourne's best fried chicken

1

ADVERTISEMENT

SPONSORED LINKS

[Celebrity news and video!](#)  
 Up to the minute celebrity gossip, photos & celebrity videos

[Breaking news video!](#)  
 Watch the latest Local and National breaking news

<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/opinion/companies-that-tell-us-lies-in-false-adverti...> 6/12/2016

But why is this deception an issue for the economy? In fact, the problem is straightforward: when companies can get away with lying, they stop competing. Why bother to compete on price if you can get away with hidden shipping charges? What's the point of working to make a nourishing product if you can falsely label it as being "fresh and healthy"? Why go to the trouble of creating innovative products if you can make any unsubstantiated claims you like?

Allowing companies to get away with misleading and deceiving consumers damages the competitive dynamic of our economy. It means less innovation, higher prices and less production, as well as more dangerous products. Trust is a fundamental ingredient if markets are to operate effectively — and eroding that trust can have substantial economic and social consequences.

Unfortunately, the problem seems to be increasing. Complaints to the competition watchdog of misleading and deceptive conduct are up one-third over the past three years. Last year, we lost a record \$229 million to scammers. That's more than \$10 for every Australian. Customers with less education and poorer social networks are particularly vulnerable to rip-offs. So what can we do to arrest this?

A central problem is that the penalty for misleading and deceptive conduct is too low. The penalty imposed on Dulux for its "ice paint" claims represents 1/5000th of its annual turnover. That is the equivalent of a speeding fine of \$16 for the average fulltime worker. Australian Competition and Consumer Commission chair Rod Sims has warned that companies consider these penalties as merely the "cost of doing business", while Federal Court Justice Michelle Gordon argues that such penalties do little to deter illegal conduct.

CURRENTLY, the penalty for breaching the Australian Consumer Law (which includes misleading and deceptive conduct) is a maximum of \$1.1 million. That is only a drop in the paint bucket for big companies. And it means that if you rip off consumers, you pay only one-ninth as much than if you breach the competition provisions of the Australian Competition and Consumer Act.

Labor went to the last election with a commonsense policy to address this problem. We proposed that the penalty for breaching the Australian Consumer Law be increased to the level of anti-competitive conduct: \$10 million.

Importantly, we also proposed to use some of the revenues from the increased penalties to double the competition watchdog's litigation budget, giving it more firepower to go after companies that flout the law. The Independent Parliamentary Budget Office estimates that such a move would still leave the federal Budget \$62 million better off over the next four years.

Raising the penalties for ripping off consumers is a practical way to reduce the damage that deceptive conduct does to consumers and to the economy.

It's time to stop trying to gloss over the problem and treat misleading conduct as the stain it really is.

**Andrew Leigh is the Shadow Assistant Treasurer and Labor's spokesman for Competition**

Loading...

Ads By Google

**Compare Health Funds**

Compare policies from some of Australia's leading Health Funds. Go to [iselect.com.au/health-insurance](http://iselect.com.au/health-insurance)



Source:

<http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/opinion/public-defender/public-defender-jeep-accused-of-being-cheap-with-customers/news-story/f59ca44d960cb9db7fe3a0262f2b6f4c>

12/6/2016

Public Defender: Jeep accused of being cheap with customers | Daily Telegraph

The Daily Telegraph



0:01 / 2:35

Ashton Wood, known for destroying his \$49,000 Jeep, sets fire to the cheque from the redress program. Supplied

Public Defender

## Public Defender: Jeep accused of being cheap with customers

John Rolfe, Public Defender, The Daily Telegraph  
October 12, 2016 11:00pm

JEEP owners say they have been let down — again — this time by the ACCC’s “redress” program meant to deal with their car woes.

A year after the scheme was set up only 60 or 70 owners have received compensation cheques, typically for less than \$1000.

The largest cheque has been for about \$5000, with Jeep’s parent, Fiat Chrysler Australia (FCA), offering to buy back vehicles on a few occasions. This is the first time results have been made public.

Owners believe the redress program is drastically undercooking their losses, leading some to pursue the carmaker legally instead.

[GOT A LEGAL PROBLEM? GET IS SORTED FOR FREE VIA THIS LINK TO OUR EXPERT Q&A](#)

### SEE MORE FROM THE PUBLIC DEFENDER

Follow John Rolfe on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#).

“I got a cheque for \$1300 and set fire to it,” said Ashton Wood, who set up the [Destroy My Jeep Facebook](#) page after bashing and burning his dud Cherokee, for which he paid \$49,000.

If you've been injured in a motor vehicle accident

**brydens** lawyers

Call Brydens about your claim today

FIRST CONSULTATION FREE\*

No Win, No Fees.\*

1800 848 848

\*Conditions apply.



Jeep owner Ashton Wood burns a cheque he got from the official ACCC "redress" program. Supplied

The redress program was announced by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission in September last year as part of its new model of dispute resolution. It followed the success former Victorian premier Jeff Kennett had on the ACCC's behalf in brokering improved outcomes for suppliers who had been rorted by Coles.

But Mr Wood said FCA's mediator had made errors calculating compensation. He said his payment was based on being without his car for 7.5 days when the correct figure was 68. Other owners had reported the same problem.



Ashton Wood destroys his 'lemon' Jeep. Picture: Megan Slade

FCA would not comment on Mr Wood's allegations or any other aspect of the redress program.



ACCC chairman Rod Sims said: "If we heard of a lot of people being dealt with factually wrongly we would certainly be knocking on the door (of FCA). We haven't had that evidence."

Ms Sims revealed the ACCC is investigating car makers over claims they denied customers their "consumer guarantee" rights. He wouldn't name the makers.

Mr Wood said he had referred about 20 owners to a law firm which had recently begun taking on dealers who sold defective Jeeps.

"I can confirm we act for multiple parties," Brisbane-based Certus Legal co-founder Darryl Richards said.

Mr Wood said it had not been possible to run a class action under Queensland law.

Ford Australia has been facing action from as many as 70,000 owners. Bannister Law was initially chasing refunds or the difference between the purchase price and the true value of the vehicles, as well as aggravated damages.

That changed earlier this week, with the firm deciding to no longer pursue refunds.

### A WHEELY SAD STATE OF AFFAIRS

WE get more complaints about Jeep than any other brand, but Mazda owners are in a tight tussle with Ford buyers for second place and the numbers show the ACCC's investigation of the whole industry is unquestionably warranted.



📷 Darren May and Mel Williams at their home in Cranebrook with their Mazda CX5 / Picture: Richard Dobson

A recent issue: Darren May and Mel Williams bought their first-ever new car, a Mazda CX5, and discovered a paint imperfection.

The dealer said it would be fixed but the smash repairer crashed their car. The couple sought redress for the car's value being reduced but got nowhere. Following our intervention they will get mag wheels, roof racks and seat covers, plus two services free.