

cc: J. A. Stekl
J. H. Chisnall

REMINGTON ARMS COMPANY, INC.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Remington



February 11, 1980

RECEIVED

FEB 11 1980

R. B. SPERLING

To: R. B. Sperling

From: E. G. Larson

Jim Stekl has encountered a problem in answering some of the 600 recall mail. Attached are two letters of the type involved.

In the Simm's Hardware complaint, the rifle was returned by a jobber, who states the customer brought it in because it allegedly fired while his son was unloading it, and caused \$250.00 damage. No specific claim was filed for damages, and our examination revealed nothing wrong with the gun. However, when we write and tell him there was nothing wrong with the gun, but we exchanged triggers, the gate is opened.

The second letter from Harvey is similar in nature, and it could not occur as explained.

It is my feeling that in each of these incidents, we should deny any responsibility because of our examination of that particular arm, and that while only a few guns were found that could be tricked, we decided to replace the triggers in all at no charge.

In most cases, this will satisfy the customer, but where we need your guidance is how we handle if customer rejects our explanation, and does seek retribution for damages.

Where a personal injury is reported, regardless of severity, Jack Chisnall will handle as is normal.

Your comments will be appreciated.

E. G. Larson

EGL:lb
Attach.