1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT								
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON								
3									
4	TERI SEE and DARREL SEE, )								
5	husband and wife,								
6	Plaintiffs, )								
7	vs. ) Case No. 81-886								
j	REMINGTON ARMS COMPANY, INC., )								
8	Defendant. )								
9									
10	Before: Honorable Edward Leavy, Magistrate United States District Court								
11									
12	TESTIMONY OF JAMES A. STEKL  March 2, 1983								
13									
14	For the Plaintiffs: BODYFELT, MOUNT & STROUP By: Peter R. Chamberlain								
15	Kathryn R. Janssen Attorneys at Law								
16	222 SW Morrison, Rm. 229 Portland, OR 97204								
17	503/243-1022								
18	For the Defendant: SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON, WYATT, MOORE & ROBERTS								
19	By: James Huegli, Local Counsel Robert Spurling, Corporate Counsel								
20	1200 Standard Plaza Portland, OR 97204								
21	503/222-9981								
22	VIOLA JOYNER, RPR Court Reporter								
23	225 U.S. Courthouse Portland, OR 97205								
24	503/221-3113								
25									

								i
	1							
	2			INDEX OF P	LAINTIFFS'	WITNES	SS	
	3	Witn	ness		D	X	ReD	
	4	Jame	es A.	Stekl	1	36	52	
	5							
	6							
	7							
	8			INDEX OF P	LAINTIFFS'	EXHIB	ETS	
	9							
	10	Exhi	.bit		Offered	Rec	ceived	Rejected
	11	No.	10	Model 700 Owner's	12		12	
	12			Manual				
	13	No.	17	Gun Examination Report No. 401	28		29	
,	14	No.	19	Gun Examination	26		27	
	15	,,,,	20	Report No. 623	20		20	
	16	No.	20	Gun Examination Report No. 431	28		29	
	17	No.	21	Gun Examination	28		29	
	18	No	22	Report Gun Examination	28		29	
	19	No.	22	Report	26		29	
	20	No.	23	Gun Examination Report No. 244	28		29	
	21	No.	24	Gun Examination	28		29	
	22	NO.	<b>4</b> 4	Report	20		<b>4.</b> 9	
	23	No.	25	Gun Examination Report	28		29	
	24	No.	26	Gun Examination	28		29	
/	اء		_ ~	Donort			-	

Report

7
- 1

						<u>ii</u>	
1	Ind	ex of	Plaintiffs' Exhibi	ts Continu	ed		
. 2							
3	Exh	ibit		Offered	Received	Rejected	
4	No.	31	Rifle	33	33		
5	No.	39	Gun Examination Report	28	29		
6 7	No.	40	Gun Examination Report	28	29		
8	No.	41	Gun Examination Report	28	29		
9	No.	42	Gun Examination Report	28	29		
11	No.	113	Rifle	33	33		
12	No.	115	Blown Up Section ( Exhibit 10	of 21		23	
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22			,				
23							
24							
25							
· — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	<u> </u>	·····					

		Stekl D 1
	1	PORTLAND, OREGON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 1983, 10:00 A.M.
• /	2	
	3	MR. CHAMBERLAIN: At this time we would call Mr. James
	4	Stekl.
	5	
	6	JAMES A. STEKL,
	7	called as an adverse witness on behalf of the plaintiff herein,
	8	having been sworn, testified as follows:
	9	THE CLERK: Please state your name and spell your last
	10	name for the record.
	11	THE WITNESS: James A. Stekl, S-t-e-k-1.
	12	
	13	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	14	BY MR. CHAMBERLAIN:
	15	O. Mr. Stekl, you are a Remington employee?
	16	A. Yes, I am.
	17	Q. What is your job title?
	18	A. I'm Supervisor of product service.
	19	Q. And one of your job functions is resolution of
	20	product complaints?
	21	A. That's right.
	22	Q. In that regard, you deal with consumer problems, and
	23	in particular with used guns that have been returned from the
	24	field?
	25	A. Yes.

Model 700 as it existed since December of 1976?

3

A. Yes.

Q.

4 5

6

Q. For example, you are aware that the bolt mechanism, the firing mechanism, safety mechanism, on the model is the same, regardless whether you are talking about Model ADL, or BDL, or a varmint?

You are familiar with the design of the Remington

7

8

Yes, that's correct.

9

And that would be true for all Remington Model 700's manufactured between January of 1971 and January of 1982;

10 11

wouldn't it?

A.

12

Yes.

13 14

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: May the witness be handed Exhibit 2, please (to the clerk, who complies).

15

(By Mr. Chamberlain) That exhibit has previously 0. been identified as the rifle involved in the shooting of Teri See. That is a Remington Model 700, is it not?

16 17

Yes, it is.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you have the rifle loaded and the bolt cocked and the rifle in the on-safe position, you can't unload that rifle, or, at least, you can't take a bullet out of the chamber without moving the safe from the on-safe position to the off-safe position; correct?

And that rifle cannot be unloaded without-- assuming

A. That's right.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

- And if you have that rifle loaded, the bolt cocked, Q. and the safety in the on-safe position, you can move the trigger of that rifle, can you not?
  - A. Yes. Yes.
- And it will move just as far as it would as if the safety were off?
  - Um-hm.
  - 0. Makes no difference?
  - A. No.
  - There is no, then, no trigger lock mechanism?
  - A. No.
  - Correct?
  - Correct. A.
- And, in fact, when the safety is in the on-safe Q. position, and that gun is loaded, and the bolt is closed, and the gun is cocked, it takes very little effort to pull the trigger rearward; isn't that true?
  - Well, very little is a relative term.
- Well, I'm using your words from letters you have written to customers, aren't I?
  - Yes, um-hm.
- And with that particular design, if the gun is loaded, the bolt is cocked and closed, and the safety is in the on-safe position, something causes that trigger to stay in a pull position, such as the finger of an operator, or such as

a gummed-up condition in the trigger assembly, when that gun is—- when the safety of that gun is moved from the safe position to the off-safe position, the gun will fire, won't it?

MR. HUEGLI: Objection, Your Honor. I believe Mr. Chamberlain has asked Mr. Stekl a compound question. One is whether something in the firearm that is gummed up; the second half of the question is, will it fire when you pull the trigger.

I think Mr. Stekl should be allowed to address those individually.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I can restate it.

THE COURT: All right.

Q. (By Mr. Chamberlain) Mr. Stekl, I'd like you to assume the way this gun is designed, loaded, cocked, bolt closed, on safety, in the on-safe position, and something, anything, causes that trigger to stay in the pull position, whether it be something in the mechanism itself, or whether it be a human finger, when that safety is moved to the fire position or the off-safe position, the gun will discharge; won't it?

A. Yes, it will, because the trigger is being pulled and the gun is no longer on safe.

Q Right. Now, you have had an opportunity, at least two opportunities to examine Exhibit 2, haven't you?

A. Yes.

	Stekl D 5
1	0. And the first time was in the presence of our expert,
. 2	Mr. Martin, back in Maryland?
3	A. Yes.
4	O. And with you, on that occasion, was a Remington
5	employee by the name of Jack Chisnel?
6	A. That's correct.
7	Q. And the second time that you had an opportunity to
8	examine this rifle was the day your deposition was taken in
9	August of 1982?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. In Ilion, New York?
12	A. Um-hm.
13	0. Now, on both those occasions, you noted the gun was
14	dirty?
15	A. Yes.
16	0. Did you not?
17	A. Yes.
18	O. And didn't you tell me at your deposition that on the
19	second occasion it was your opinion that the gun wasn't as
20	dirty as it had been on the first?
21	A. Well, it I wasn't sure of that. It's possible. I
22	mean, you know, it's been handled. Somebody could have wiped
23	it off.
24	Q. Well, let's make sure you understand my question. The
25	day your deposition was taken you told me, did you not, that it

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

12

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

appeared to you on that date that the gun was in better condition than it was when you saw it before?

- It appeared to be, um-hm.
- And later in your deposition, didn't you tell me that would be partly explainable because a firearm can lose some lubrication over time?

MR. HUEGLI: Your Honor, if Mr. Chamberlain is going to attempt to impeach Mr. Stekl with the deposition, the proper impeachment would be to ask him a question and the answers as read at that time, rather than summarize it.

This is an improper method of impeachment, if that is what he's attempting to do.

THE COURT: It's overruled.

- (By Mr. Chamberlain) Didn't you tell me in your deposition that part of the explanation for why that rifle may have been cleaner on the day of the deposition than it was when you had seen it previously was that a firearm can lose some lubrication over time?
- As I remember it, Mr. Chamberlain, you asked me that question at a different time. It wasn't in the same line of questioning as, was the gun in the same condition at the time of the deposition as it was at the time of my original examination.
- Let me read to you the question and the answers, and you tell me if this was the answer you gave, at page 29, of

Now, an inoperative bolt stop could never cause a

Remington Model 700 to fire when the safety is released, had

0.

it?

23

24

25

	[]		1
			Stekl D 8
	1	А.	Not that point alone, no.
<ul><li>√</li><li>✓</li></ul>	2	Q.	And the first time you examined the rifle, you noted
	3	that the	trigger assembly contained what you described as
	4	solidifie	d solvent, correct?
	5	A.	Yes.
	6	Ω	You noted that the trigger pull was within Remington
	7	specifica	tions?
	8	А.	As I remember, yes.
	9	Q.	The trigger pull is just the number of pounds it
	10	takes to	pull the trigger?
	11	A.	Correct.
	12	Q.	That is something that is adjustable?
	13	A.	Yes.
,	14	Ö.	And Remington sets a specification and says it's
	15	between t	hree and five pounds that is acceptable?
	16	А.	I believe that is what the specifications are.
	17	Q.	And you also noted in your original examination that
	18	the rifle	trigger adjusting screws had not been adjusted?
	19	Α.	They didn't appear to be.
	20	Q.	And in particular, you noted that the adhesive
	21	coating o	ver those screws was intact, right?
	22	A.	As I remember.
	23	Q.	And that adhesive coating was of the same type that
	24	Remington	uses?
*	25	A.	It appeared to be.
	!		

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A.

0,

A.

Yes.

I have seen others.

You have seen more than 10 of them?

S 1575

assume that means.

24

25

23

(By Mr. Chamberlain) Now, the owner's manual does tell the user, give the user a reason for not using too much

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

```
1
     lubrication, doesn't it, down in the lubrication section of
2
     the manual?
3
          A.
               Yes.
          Q.
               Would you like to see it?
4
               Yes, I would. I don't remember the exact wording.
5
         MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Could the witness be handed Exhibit 10,
6
7
    please -- I may still have it here.
               (The clerk provides the exhibit as requested to the
8
    witness.)
9
         Q.
               (By Mr. Chamberlain) Before we get to that, Mr.
10
    Stekl, could you identify Exhibit 10 for the jury?
11
               This is a copy of a Model 700 bolt action rifle
12
    owner's manual.
13
              And that's the owner's manual that was included in the
         Q.
14
    box with new Model 700 rifles in December of '76?
15
         A.
              I would think so, yes.
16
         MR. CHAMBERLAIN: We'll offer Exhibit 10.
17
         MR. HUEGLI: No objection.
18
         THE COURT: Received.
19
               (By Mr. Chamberlain) Now, turn to the-- the cover
20
    is page 1. If you would turn to the third page, you will find
21
    the lubrication section.
22
         A.
              Yes.
23
24
         0.
              Did you find that?
25
         A.
              Yes.
```

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Your Honor, we have a-- we have that same section as a blown up photo, Exhibit 115. Might we put that on the board for the jury's benefit?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I think it's over in that stack (to the clerk, who places the exhibit on the easel).

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Can we move that a little closer to the jury, perhaps (the clerk complies).

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Can each of you see it now? All right.

Q (By Mr. Chamberlain) Now, Mr. Stekl, let's turn your attention to lubrication section. First sentence, where it says, talks about using little or no oil. It gives the owner a reason for using little or no oil, doesn't it?

A. Yes, um-hm.

O. And the reason is that the gun will stay clean longer?

A. Yes.

Q. And nowhere in that section does it suggest that the gun not kept in that clean condition, that it will malfunction; does it?

A. No.

THE COURT: Mr. Chamberlain, I don't know what your purpose is in answering that question. The rest of us could answer it. And the exhibit is in evidence, and I don't see the

Q. Let's take oil. Would you agree that oil is thicker 24 at lower temperatures than it is at higher temperatures? 25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

A. I would think so, most oils.

And if there was thicker lubrication in the trigger mechanism, that lubrication could prevent the trigger mechanism from working properly, couldn't it?

Possibly, um-hm. A.

And it could cause the rifle to fire when the safety was released, couldn't it?

I would say that is a possibility.

Let's talk about some other possible causes of a 0. Remington Model 700 firing when the safety is released.

If the rifle had, say, broken trigger assembly parts, that could cause it, could it not?

A. Yes. Yes.

And you have examined Exhibit 2, and there are no broken trigger assembly parts?

A. No.

Q. Improper adjustment of adjusting screws could cause it?

It's a possibility. Α.

And you have already told us there was no such improper adjusting in this case?

A. Doesn't appear to.

Lubricant or solvent residue in the trigger mechanism could cause it?

A. Yes.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- A. Yes, we have.
- And on some of those complaints, it has been your conclusion, or the Committee's conclusion that the FSR, or fire when safe release condition was caused by gum-up fire control?
  - A. There is a possibility.
- Fire control is the same as the trigger mechanism, right?
  - A. Yes. Yes.
- 0. And when you use the term, or when I use the term gummed up, you understand that to mean that lubricant or other substance, such as solvent, is present in the trigger assembly parts, have evaporated and left a gummy residue in the trigger assembly?
  - Yes, basically. A.
- When you see that condition, the solvent and/or lubricant in a certain percentage of gun owner's lists; don't you?

You would agree with me that a trigger that is gummed up is more apt to suffer a firing when the safe is released in cold weather, because the substance in the trigger will be thicker?

MR. HUEGLI: Objection. This is exactly the problem that I was afraid would occur that we are not asking a witness to speculate on any one of a number of variables and only giving

him two and asking him whether or not he agrees it's more likely to happen when only two variances are placed in a sequence.

I would object to this as being without any foundation as to what happened in this case, that's See versus Remington case. This is not somebody in Georgia.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: There is evidence they were hunting in cold temperatures, evidence that the rifle did have some gum-up, and the witness has demonstrated in the deposition that he is capable of answering the question.

MR. HUEGLI: Your Honor, first, there is no evidence that these people were hunting in any significant cold temperatures.

Mr. Chamberlain and I both have a certified transcript of temperature at that time, if he would like to lay a foundation and tell the jury the true facts, we have no objection to producing a certified transcript of the weather report that we both have and let the witness answer the questions based upon the facts.

THE COURT: It's overruled.

You can answer.

Do you have the question in mind? If you do not, the reporter will read it for you.

(Whereupon, the reporter reads the last question aloud.)

THE WITNESS: Well, I would think that it would depend
how cold, number one, and then, again, I think it would make

It's also true that that gun might not fire when the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A.

Q.

malfunction at room temperature?

That is a possibility.

No, please repeat it.

25

S 1586

8

7

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. The question was, in fact, the Exhibit 2, the accident rifle, did fire when the safety was released on the day of the accident, and if that rifle was cleaned after the day of the accident, would it surprise you that the rifle would not duplicate the malfunction after cleaning; that wouldn't surprise you, would it?
  - A. No. Depending on the removal.
- Q. You have seen lots of-- you have seen lots of what you would call dirty Model 700's that don't fire when the safe is released?
  - A. We have seen some, yes.
- O. I would like to talk briefly about Remington's document retention policy. Gun Examination Committee Reports are written up in the forms called Gun Examination Reports, right?
  - A. Right.
- O. And those Gun Examination Reports are subject to DuPont's three-year document retention program?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And I say DuPont, because DuPont is the corporation that owns Remington?
  - A. That's right.
  - O So after three years, they are destroyed?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And if I requested documents, say, for the last five

1 years, I would only actually get the last three years? 2 That's right. That's right. 3 Now, as part of your work on the Gun Examina-4 tion Committee, you write customers at the gun shops about the 5 comlaints that they have stated? 6 A. Yes. 7 And every complaint that you receive is responded to 8 in the regular course of your business, right? 9 Every complaint that I receive, is that your question? 10 11 0. Right. Every complaint that the Gun Examination Committee receives would be responded to in the normal course? 12 A. 13 Yes, yes one way or another. And with the Model 700, typically, it was you that 14 15 did that correspondence, was it not? In the majority of cases. 16 MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Could the witness be handed Exhibit 20, 17 please (to the clerk, who complies). 18 At this time we would offer Exhibit 115, which is 19 the enlargement of page 3 of Exhibit 10. 20 THE COURT: 21 Mr. Huegli, do you have an objection to the offer of the exhibit? 22 It's exhibit number what? 23 24 MR. CHAMBERLAIN: 115. 25 MR. HUEGLI: It's one of those boards there?

Behind that is also your response to the customer;

24

25

A.

Q.

Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

is that correct?

A.

A.

A.

Q.

A.

complaint; right?

is missing here.

Yes.

Yes.

--typically.

form?

Report, do you see that?

Yes, um-hm.

Yes, um-hm.

That's correct.

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Your Honor, I don't know when you want to take your morning break. I've quite a bit more with Mr. Stekl.

MR. HUEGLI: We take the same position we have previously.

2

THE COURT: All right. Overruled.

3

That is Exhibit 19?

4

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: That's right, Your Honor.

5

THE COURT: It's received.

6 7

8

Now, I think you understand that there is no need for him to read any exhibit to us. If it's necessary in order for him to understand a question, I'm not going to be very sensitive about this, but I ask that you just not spend our

9

time having a witness reading to us.

11

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: All right. If you will give me just a moment here, I'll get them all together and have him identify them, and we can put them into evidence.

13

12

Could I have some exhibits handed to the witness, please (to the bailiff, who complies).

15

16

17

14

0. (By Mr. Chamberlain) Mr. Stekl, I've handed you a stack of exhibits, and if you would keep them in the order that I have handed them to you in, we will talk about them in that order, starting with-- the top one Exhibit 23 of the group that I just handed you?

18 19

A. What is your order? This isn't the order that they are in.

21

20

Q. Well, find Exhibit 23 there.

22 23

A. Okay, here's 23.

24

25

Q. Okay. And can you identify that for the jury,

1	please.
2	A. Yes, that's a Gun Examination Report No. 244.
3	Q. And involving a Model 700 where the customer's
4	complaint was that the gun fired when the safety was released?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Do you have Exhibit 42 there?
7	A. No, I don't seem to find 42.
8	0. How about Exhibit 17?
9	A. I'm
10	Oh, here it is.
11	Q. Okay. And can you identify that to the jury, please.
12	A. Gun Examination Report No. 401, I believe.
13	Q. Involving a Remington Model 700 where the customer's
14	complaint was that the gun fired when the safety was released?
15	A. That's correct.
16	Q. Do you have Exhibit 17 before you?
17	A. Yes.
18	MR. HUEGLI: Your Honor, we will stipulate that
19	everything that Mr. Chamberlain is going to put into evidence
20	is a gun fired when safe was released. I don't think it's
21	necessary to repeat it in every instance.
22	THE COURT: All right.
23	MR. CHAMBERLAIN: In that case, we would offer Exhibits 19,
24	23, 42, 17, 41, 21, 39, 22, 40, 24, 20, 26, 25.
25	THE COURT: Same position on them?

MR. HUEGLI: Yes, Your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

THE COURT: Same ruling. They are each received.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Thank you.

(By Mr. Chamberlain) Mr. Stekl, in your repair correspondence with gun owners, one of the things that you typically tell them is that Remington strongly recommends that oil be used sparingly on the rifle, with no lubrication added to the trigger mechanism; aren't those your words?

A. Yes.

Those words are typically found in the letters that you write to customers about Model 700 malfunctions?

A. Yes.

0. Other than the language that you testified about in the lubrication section of the owner's manual, Exhibit 10, there is nowhere else that any such strong recommendation is printed, is there?

Let me clarify that, if you need it. Printed in material that is given to the owner when he purchases the gun in December of '76.

A. No.

0. Do you have Exhibit 10 before you still, the owner's manual?

A. Yes.

Yeah. That particular copy is a photocopy. Q.

Yes, it is.

23

24

25

the rifle when the rifle stayed in the safe position.

2

THE COURT: All right.

if I might, Your Honor.

3

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I want to ask one more question on that,

4

5

THE COURT: All right.

6

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Can I approach the exhibits?

7

THE COURT: Yes.

8

(By Mr. Chamberlain) Mr. Stekl, your counsel has agreed that it would be feasible to remove the bolt lock

10

9

feature, and it could have been done in 1976.

11

Exhibit 47, photograph of the trigger assembly, that all that

12 13

would be required to accomplish that change would be to shorten

Would you agree with me that, referring now to

14

the right-hand side of the lever arm?

15

MR. HUEGLI: Your Honor, I object. There is no particular

16

reason to show how we would have done it.

17

I think his expert is going to show how we could have done it. This man is not an engineer. It's feasible it could

19

18

be done in any number of ways.

20

THE COURT: It's overruled.

21

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Do you remember the question?

22

THE COURT: Please repeat it.

23

(By Mr. Chamberlain) Isn't it a fact on or about 0.

24

December 1976 to eliminate the bolt action feature on the

25

Model 700 rifle, at least one of the ways that it could have

MR. HUEGLI: Mr. Linde advised me we did, and we will stipulate to it. We will stipulate at that time we produced this rifle with no bolt lock in '73, '74.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: In that event, I would offer Exhibit 113, which is the Model 591 Remington, and I would offer Exhibit 30, I believe it is, which is-- correction, Exhibit 31, the Remington Model 788 rifle.

MR. HUEGLI: The jury would like to take them in the jury room, I suppose, but I see no relevance.

THE COURT: Wait a minute.

MR. HUEGLI: I would object. I see no relevance in taking those rifles that we stipulated that we had manufactured rifles with and without bolt locks at the time this gun was made. I see no relevance to proving something that is already a stipulated fact.

THE COURT: It's overruled. They are received.

Q. (By Mr. Chamberlain) Now, Mr. Stekl, I've got just a couple more questions for you. I want you--

Do you remember Exhibit 2, the accident rifle?

A. Yes.

Q. I want you to assume that the person handling that rifle on October 27, of 1979, was going to unload it; I want you to assume that the gun was loaded and cocked and on safe at the time; and assume that when the safety was pushed from the safe position to the fire position, the gun discharged. Just assume

1 |

5

those facts.

You would agree with me, wouldn't you, that assuming those facts, that if that rifle had been designed such that you could open the bolt and unload the rifle without pushing the safety to the fire position, that the rifle could have been unloaded on that occasion without having it discharged?

MR. HUEGLI: Objection. We are now asking the witness to assume where we have a gun that is loaded, you push the safety forward to the fire position; and the second portion of the question is asking whether it could be unloaded with the safety on.

It's a compound question that is completely confusing.

THE COURT: I'll have to hear it.

(The reporter reads the last question.)

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Just for clarification, is that as to form, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

Q. (By Mr. Chamberlain) Let me try to rephrase the question, Mr. Stekl. I want you to assume that the person handling Exhibit 2 on October 27, of 1979, was approaching the rifle for the purpose of unloading it. All right. That that was his intent. And assume the rifle was loaded. Assume it was cocked. By that, I mean the bolt had been cocked and closed, and the rifle was in the on-safe position. Assume that

1

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

in attempting to unload the gun, the gun owner then grasped the bolt handle, tried to open the gun to unload it, could not do so, because of the bolt lock feature.

Assume that he then pushed the safety from the onsafe position to the off-safe position and the rifle discharged.

Would you agree with me that if that rifle on that date did not have a bolt lock, the person, in trying to unload that gun, never would have reached the point where he had to touch the safety; and, therefore, the gun would not have discharged?

- I'm still confused on that one.
- All right. I'll read it exactly as I put it to you at page 63 of your deposition, taken last August.

(Reading:) Question: I have given you some facts and assumptions that the person handling this Model 700 in October of '79, and by this Model 700, I mean Exhibit 2, the person was approaching it for the purpose of unloading it, and the gun was loaded; it was cocked and was on safe. I want you to also assume that it was moved from the safe position to the fire postiion it discharged; assume those facts. If this Exhibit 2 had been designed as such that you could open the bolt without pushing the safety to the fire position, this rifle could

0 Mr Stokl

24

25

Q Mr. Stekl, I think the jury would be interested in you telling them some of your background in your handling of

firearms and your work at Remington.

Would you please tell the jury when you started to work at Remington and what you did when you first started to work there and how you arrived at your position you are currently employed at.

A. Okay. I started in October of '67; and for the first eight or nine months, I worked in the Research and Measurement Lab, making electronic measurements of various ballistic functions, gun functions, and things of that nature.

Then, right after that, I went to work in the Custom Firearms Department, doing development work on our target rifles, particularly our bench rest target rifles. I worked at that for, oh, golly, five, six, seven years.

Right after that I was made supervisor or Foreman, let's say, of the Bench Rest Bullet Production Area. This was—we actually manufactured the bullets to be used in bench rest target shooting. I was on that job for two years, possibly.

And then from there, I went in to my present job, and I started that in February of '79.

Q. Thank you. Mr. Stekl, Remington Firearms Company has produced over the years literally millions of rifles and shotguns of various kinds and makes; is that true?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Object as leading. No foundation. I don't know what the source of that information is.

THE COURT: It is leading, but I take it it's preliminary.

MR. HUEGLI: Truly preliminary, yes.

2

THE COURT: It's overruled.

3

THE WITNESS: Yes, we have.

4 5

(By Mr. Huegli) In your job currently did you receive complaints specifically on the Remington 700; is that

6

all you do for a living?

7

A. No.

Q.

8 9

Maybe you can tell us, Mr. Stekl, what the purpose of the Firearms Return Gun Committee was, its purpose and who

10

sits on that committee, how does Remington set it up?

11

Well, basically, it's made up of personnel from our Research and Development Division, from our Processing Engineer

Division.

13

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Of course, I'm on it, being in Product Services, and, basically, we want to see the problem areas, find what they are, you know, resulting from the use of our products.

Our engineers are interested in the problems that people say they are having. That is our process people.

Naturally, I'm interested in it, because my basic job is working on a resolution of problems.

Now, Mr. Chamberlain has introduced so the jury can hear several pieces of testimony from individuals as well as introduced some Gun Examination Reports that were produced by Remington that were recorded that you had in your office, or, at least, in the building there at Remington; is that correct?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

evidence and has been admitted.

Do you have that before you?

- A. Yes, I have it.
- Before we look at that, I'd like to ask you some
  preliminary questions. In the last three years, according to
  your records, you received 49 complaints from individuals who
  own the 700 that complained the gun went off when they pushed
  the safety forward; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q And during that period of time, you examined each one of those rifles; you have got the rifle and you looked at it and sent a response back?
  - A. The committee has, yes.
- Okay. Now, was the examination that the committee undertook in those instances the same as the examination that was undertaken of Mr. Boudreau's rifle in this lawsuit; was it the same detailed examination, extensive?
  - A. No, not really.
- Q For instance, in those examinations, when you drop the trigger out of the gun to look at it, do you tear the trigger mechanism apart to see what is inside the casing of it?
- ${\tt A.} \quad {\tt No} \,, \,\, {\tt we} \,\, {\tt do} \,\, {\tt not} \,\, {\tt completely} \,\, {\tt disassemble} \,\, {\tt the} \,\, {\tt trigger}$  mechanism, no.
  - Q. Now, taking a look at Exhibit 23, if you will, I'd

like to refer you to some questions about that exhibit.

2

In this particular exhibit, the complaint was that the gun will discharge when the safety is released; is that correct?

4

5

A. That's right.

6

Q. All right. Now thank you, John.

7

Now, would you tell the jury whether that gun, when you got it back, was in the same condition it was when it left

8

the Remington Firearms Factory, referring to the bottom portion

10

A. No, it was not.

of that document.

that gun do to it?

had been altered.

11

0. What did the owner of that gun, what did the owner of

13

12

A. According to the report--

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Same objection.

does not know what the owner did.

14

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Well, I'll object. No foundation. He

16

15

Q. (By Mr. Huegli) What was done to the gun?

17

v. (by Mr. ndegri) what was done to the gun:

18

THE COURT: Wait a minute. There is no pending question.

20

19

Q. (By Mr. Huegli) I mean, by the examination of that

21

rifle, can you tell us if someone, be it the owner or some third party, did something to that rifle after it left

22

Remington which caused the problem that you found?

2324

A. Yes, it was noted that the trigger adjusting screws

25

1	Q. (By Mr. Huegli) Is that a trigger assembly?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And it is sealed on this side; is that correct?
4	MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Well, Your Honor, I have an objection.
5	If he's going to discuss it and show it to the jury, I'd like
6	it in evidence so we can use it as well.
7	THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
8	MR. HUEGLI: Well, I'll get one that is not cut up and
9	introduce that.
10	${f Q}$ . (By Mr. Huegli) Are the trigger assemblies sealed;
11	they are not something that you can take apart with a screw-
12	driver?
13	A. No, they are riveted and welded.
14	Q All right. I'd like to call your attention to Exhibit
15	40. This is another complaint by a customer that their gun
16	went off, as Mr. Chamberlain stated.
17	Do you have that before you?
18	A. Yes, here it is.
19	${\mathfrak Q}$ Would you tell me whether that gun was in the same
20	condition when you got it back as when it left the Remington
21	Firearms Factory?
22	MR. CHAMBERLAIN: May I have a question in aid of
23	objection, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Yes.
25	

## QUESTIONS IN AID OF OBJECTION

2

## BY MR. CHAMBERLAIN:

4 5

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

Mr. Stekl, how do you know what condition any particular gun is in when it leaves Remington's hands? I understand you know their general practice, but how do you know what condition a particular rifle is in?

- Well, whose question do I answer first?
- 0. (By Mr. Chamberlain) Mine.
- In this particular case, I know that it was different A. when it came back than when it left, because there was renewed--
- Wait a minute. My question is: How do you know what condition it is in when it leaves Remington's hands; you know what their specifications call for, but how do you know on a particular gun what the condition is?
- I know what the sealant is that we put on our adjusting screws.
- Q. You are assuming that the gun was manufactured according to Remington specifications?
  - A. Yes.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: My objection, Your Honor, is, counsel is asking this witness to describe the difference of the qun at the time of the examination versus an earlier time that has not been established that he knew what the condition was on the earlier date.

3

**4** 5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, my recollection may be different from yours, and I thought he was asking him whether he knew, and let's go back to the question and see.

MR. HUEGLI: I'll rephrase the question for purposes of this objection.

THE COURT: All right.

- (By Mr. Huegli) Mr. Stekl, based upon your experience working at Remington for the last decade plus, do you know when a rifle leaves our factory, a 700, has sealant on the trigger adjusting screws when it goes out the door?
  - A. Yes, it does.
  - Q. What color is it?
  - A. It's clear yellowish, clear to clear.
- Q. On Exhibit 40 did it come back to you with the same sealant on it?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Same objection. Again, he's testifying what is usually done, no showing what was done on this particular gun, no firsthand knowledge for him to draw a comparison from.

THE COURT: It's overruled.

Q. (By Mr. Huegli) Please answer the question. Mr. Stekl, did this gun come back in the same condition it was when it left the factory?

THE COURT: No, that's not the question.

MR. HUEGLI: The question--

And some of those cases, you have indicated that

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

Honor?

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

That is correct. A.

Q, Are there any instances that you simply cannot explain?

A. Yes.

When you get these guns back, you say you don't tear Q. the trigger apart, sometimes you replace the trigger; is that correct?

A. That is right.

Now, I'd like to call your attention to the rifle in the lawsuit, which is -- is not the same as --

It's different from these rifle problems.

If I might approach the witness with this gun, Your

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HUEGLI: Which one is it?

MR. LINDE: Third one over on the left there.

(By Mr. Huegli) I'd like you to take a look at Exhibit 2, Mr. Stekl, and when you examined this rifle with Mr. Martin, did it appear to you to be in approximately the same condition as it is today?

A. Externally, yes.

Okay. And have you had a chance today to open that

rifle up and look inside to see if anybody has cleaned it?

A. No.

Q. Now maybe you can show the jury— we have talked about the trick test many, many times, and I would like you to, if you would, to step down from the witness stand, go in front of the jury, and explain to the jury how Remington Firearms examines a rifle in relationship to the trick test. Show them what the trick test is and show the jury whether that gun can be tricked.

THE COURT: Where do you want to be?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I just want to be able to see what he's doing.

THE COURT: That's all right.

THE WITNESS: Basically, the trick test amounts to closing the bolt, pulling the safety all of the way back, then the safety is put in a position midway between the fire and safe position; then the trigger is pulled, released, and the safety is released.

If the gun, if any gun, fails the trick test, the firing pin would have fallen. This gun did not fail the trick test. It stayed and remained cocked.

Q. (By Mr. Huegli) In your experience, has, if you are able to trick a rifle once, in your experience, are you able after a certain number of tests to trick a rifle again?

A. Yes.

Thank you, Mr. Stekl. You had an opportunity, did you not, to examine this rifle with Mr. Martin, who is sitting in the back of the courtroom, back East?

A. Yes.

there, or it isn't.

Were either you or Mr. Martin able to cause that gun to discharge in that examination as Mr. Chamberlain wants this jury to believe?

No. A.

To the best of your knowledge, do you know of anybody who has ever looked at that rifle who has ever been able to duplicate that event?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Object to the form of the question.

THE COURT: Be more specific.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: It's his witness. I don't think he's entitled to lead him.

THE COURT: It's overruled.

(By Mr. Huegli) Please answer the question. Q.

Please repeat it. A.

Do you know of anybody who has ever examined this

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q,

rifle, if it can be tricked?

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

THE COURT: Overruled.

rifle, of all of the experts that we have hired, or anybody else, that has been able to duplicate this event?

- A. No, I don't.
- Q. You had a chance to examine the rifle and look inside the trigger at one time, did you not?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Did you see inside the trigger whether or not it was clean or dirty?
- A. No, it was dirty. There was an accumulation of something in there.
  - Q. Okay. Now, I'm not--

I don't want to ask you a question about the other complaints that we have had. I want to direct this question only to the lawsuit in this courtroom today and that rifle.

- A. Okay.
- Q. Based upon your experience in examining the rifles at Remington, do you have an opinion whether or not the accumulation of dirt or grease in this gun had anything at all to do with this accident?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Object to the form of the question.

No foundation laid that he has that expertise in that area;

has not been established the condition of the rifle on the

date that he examined was the same as the condition of the

rifle on the date that the accident occurred.

There, pointed out that your examination, or

25

Q.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

700's?

ReD

А.	Not millions and millions of 700's. I don't know
how many	we have of a particular model, but it's a lot of them,
millions	of rifles totally.
Q.	Oh, now is that how you understood his question?
A.	The way I interpreted it.
Q.	How long has the Remington Model 700 been sold?
А.	I think it was introduced in '62 or '63.
Q.	So it's been sold for 20 years?
А.	Yeah.
Ō.	And when Mr. Huegli was pointing out that only 49
complaint	es had been received, in fact, that is just 49
complaint	s in three-year period, because of Remington's
document	destruction program; isn't it?
А.	That's right.
Q.	There could have been 49 complaints three years before
that and	49 the three years before that, couldn't there?
А.	I can't comment on that.
Q.	Could have been more, could have been less than that?
А.	It's possible.
Q.	And we will never know, because those documents don't
exist.	
	Do you know how many Model 700's have been manu-
factured	and sold by Remington?
A.	No, sir, I don't.
Q.	Now, you explained to the jury
	how many millions  Q. A. Q. A. Q. Complaint complaint document  A. Q. that and  A. Q. exist.  factured  A.

		Stekl ReD 56
	1	A. The trigger is being held.
<i>i</i> .	2	Q. Even though it's not a trickable gun?
	3	A. That possibility exists.
	4	0 So, when the fire when safe is released, a problem,
	5	it doesn't matter if that safety starts out in full safe
	6	position or so-called in position halfway between fire and safe,
	7	functionally, it makes no difference?
	8	A. No.
	9	Q. That no means you agree with my statement?
	10	A. Yes.
	11	MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Thank you. No further questions.
	12	MR. HUEGLI: Nothing further.
	13	THE COURT: All right, sir, that's all.
	14	Now, members of the jury, we'll recess until 1:30
	15	this afternoon.
	16	(Whereupon, this witness' testimony was concluded.)
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
· .	24	
·	25	

1	State of Oregon )
2	)ss. County of Multnomah)
3	I, Viola Joyner, RPR, do hereby certify that the foregoing
4	pages 1 through 56 are a true and accurate transcription of
5	my stenotype notes as reported at the time and place
6	heretofore indicated in re SEE v. REMINGTON, USDC 81-866.
7	Dated this 3rd day of Jure, 1983, at Portland, Oregon
8	
9	VIOLA JOYNER, RPR
10	Official Reporter
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	