

A

REMINGTON ARMS COMPANY, INC.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE



cc: E. F. Barrett
E. F. Sienkiewicz
J. A. Stekl

*File
M/S - recall
Event at 3/6/79
Prod Safety
C. M. J.*

February 26, 1979

To: J. E. Preiser
From: E. G. Larson
Subject: Returned Bolt Action Rifles

Attached is a copy of a memo from Ed Sienkiewicz relative to other than Model 600's returned for allegedly firing on release of safety. Ed makes a point, but several items require some thought:

1. Based on our policy, any gun returned that is found to have a material or workmanship defect, should be repaired at no charge. This has always been our policy.
2. Because we specifically have asked that any bolt action gun, allegedly firing on release of safety, be returned at our expense, more or less obliges us to make a no charge repair.
3. Obsolete guns present another problem because parts are not easily interchanged.

I agree with Ed that worn or misused guns returned should bear a charge for repair. This will require a change in our request for return, and probably involve a management decision.

Any gun received in which we find a safety problem, regardless of cause, should be brought to the attention of the owner. I suggest that in the case of obsolete, worn, or misused guns, we advise the owner of the cause, and send him an estimate of cost of the repair required. Again, this is a management decision.

One thing that bears investigation (I initiated same several months back, but no answer to date) is a cold test, and accelerated storage of the oil-lube-protective materials used by the plant on new guns. Several reports from the field indicate a varnishing effect accrues after a period of time, causing a malfunction of trigger components. Cold temperature would induce a more severe condition.

Let's discuss.

E. G. Larson

E. G. Larson

EGL:lb

H

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT
3369

AL 0031452