Safety Research & Strategies, Inc.
340 Anawan Street / Suite 200
Rehoboth, MA 02769
Ph. 508-252-2333, Fax 508-252-3137
www.safetyresearch.net

December 20, 2006

The Honorable Nicole Nason
Administrator
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20590

RE: Comments on Tire Aging, Docket 2005-21276

Dear Administrator Nason:

The following submission is a continuation of our comments on tire age degradation.[1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] In these comments, we are submitting an updated list of real-world crashes resulting from tread separations in tires older than six years and addressing history of the current date coding found in the Tire Identification Number (TIN) and the need to provide a consumer-friendly date of manufacture.

Safety Research & Strategies is a research, consulting and advocacy firm specializing in motor vehicle safety issues. We work with organizations and individuals who share our goals of improving safety and reducing harm in the motor vehicle and transportation environment. Our clients include lawyers, engineering firms, government, and corporations whose products enhance safety and reduce injury.

Attached is a spreadsheet containing a list of 108 incidents in which tires older than six years experienced tread / belt separations—most resulting in loss-of-control crashes. These incidents have caused 85 fatalities and 115 injuries. This list represents incidents that SRS has identified primarily through a survey of litigation, which is one of the only publicly available sources of these incidents. As we noted in our July 27, 2006 comments to this docket[7] the Early Warning Reporting (EWR) data, which is still only

[1] Docket 15400-12, September 17, 2003
[2] Docket 15400-31 and 15400-32, November 5, 2004
[3] Docket 21276-5; May 25, 2004
[4] Docket 21276-9, August 4, 2005
[5] Docket 21276-20 / Docket 12150-69; July, 27, 2006
[6] Docket 21276-27, September 28, 2006
[7] Docket 21276-20 / Docket 12150-69; July, 27, 2006

available to NHTSA and not the public, excludes these incidents since Section 579.26 *Reporting Requirements for Manufacturers of Tires* only requires reports on tires that were manufactured less than five years prior to the claim.

The attached case list consists predominantly of severe injury or fatality incidents in which there are significant economic damages. This is expected, as the primary source of these incidents is products liability litigation. The list does include several non-litigation incidents that we have learned about; however, as the agency knows, most incidents that do not involve injuries or fatalities go undocumented and uninvestigated. Furthermore, the expense associated with pursuing products liability claims generally prevents lawsuits from being filed unless the damages are greater than several hundred thousand dollars. Because there is no economic incentive to pursue cases with lesser damages, many of the less severe injury claims potentially related to aged tires are not investigated, pursued or recorded in ways that are accessible. The end result is that the incidents SRS has documented in the attached list represent only a small percentage of the real-world problem associated with aged tires. Because litigation serves as a bell-weather for trends, we suspect that aged tires are contributing to a significantly larger number of failures than those we have documented.

It is striking that there is an absence of high-speed rated tires in the attached list. As we noted in our submission to the docket that included a statistical analysis of the Phoenix Tire dataset, high-speed rated tires are generally designed with a more robust construction to handle the increased demands that accompany high speeds.[8] This robust construction may have an impact on the performance of a tire as it ages. Features like high-halobutyl content inner liners and cap plies, among others, are known to have a positive effect on belt-edge separations and enhance the likelihood a tire will remain intact for a longer time increasing the probability it will wear out before a catastrophic failure.

There are many reasons why aged tires may end up in service on a vehicle—and many of these aged tires appear to be safe and serviceable. The Desanges case highlights the dangers of little-used or unused spares, which were the culprits in nearly a-third of the crashes in our list. In this case, the tire was an OE spare on a 1994 Chevrolet G20 12-passenger van. The tire, a Uniroyal Tiger Paw, made during the 34th week of 1993, was placed into service prior to a trip between the Northeast and Florida. On the return trip to Florida, the tire suffered a tread separation and the vehicle became uncontrollable and rolled. Three occupants were fatally injured; a fourth was rendered a quadriplegic.

In the Mizenko case, Bryan Mizenko purchased a 1989 Bronco II in 2001. At some unknown later date , the original spare, a Firestone FR480 made in the fourth week

[8] Docket 21276-27, September 28, 2006

of 1989, was placed on the vehicle. In August 2003, the former spare experienced a tread separation, causing the vehicle to rollover. Mr. Mizenko suffered catastrophic closed head injuries and is also paralyzed.

Because consumers—and in many cases tire dealers and service centers—have little information on the hazards associated with aged tires, there are circumstances in which old tires are often unknowingly sold or installed as new. Several of the incidents in the attached list typify this scenario. In the case of Javier Rene Garcia Sr., the right rear tire on his Honda Accord failed on July 30, 2005 while driving on Texas Highway 359 south of Realitos. Mr. Garcia's vehicle became uncontrollable and he struck a 2001 Chevrolet S-10 pickup truck driven by Jonny Lee Woodall. The tire that failed was a Firestone-made Exxon branded Signature II made in 42nd week of 1991. The tire was purchased by the decedent several months prior to the crash from a local tire dealer. Mr. Garcia, his girlfriend, Jenilee Rodriguez and his seven-year-old son all suffered fatal injuries. Mr. Woodall suffered serious injuries. Ms. Rodriguez is survived by three minor children ages nine, seven, and four and are now being cared for by her mother.

Similarly, Fertune Blanchard, 17 years old, was driving southbound on I-95 from her mother's house in Jacksonville, Florida back to her father's house in Tampa, where she lived and attended high school. She was driving a 2001 Ford Explorer that her father had recently purchased for her when the tread on the vehicle's right rear tire separated causing the vehicle to become uncontrollable. The vehicle rolled over when it left the roadway and Fertune was ejected and killed. When the Blanchards purchased the Explorer, it had previously been fitted with a set of four matching Michelin XCLT4 tires. Three of the tires were made in the 35th week of 2001, the remaining tire, and the one that failed, was manufactured in the 29th week of 1994. All of the tires were manufactured at Michelin's Nova Scotia plant. The accident occurred on May 29, 2006, making the subject tire approximately 12 years old at the time of the crash.

There are many other examples of similar tragedies in the attached incident list. Again, these incidents underscore the immediate need for policies to alert consumers that tires have service limits beyond obvious and visible tread depth and for a regulation requiring non-coded dates of manufacture.

On November 5, 2004 Safety Research & Strategies petitioned NHTSA to initiate rulemaking to require a consumer-friendly date of manufacture molded into tire sidewalls. Our petition requested that tire labeling rulemaking commence separately from the tire performance standards so as not to become mired in that lengthy process. As we noted in our petition, a simple date of manufacture will *not* conflict with other possible requirements, regardless of any future agency action on the issue of tire aging. Rather than consider this approach, the agency decided to lump this petition into the tire

performance rulemaking and indicated it would be considered at some future date. The result is that the agency continues to delay addressing this issue at a key time before the new Tire Identification Number (TIN) rules are required and manufacturers have completed their investment in new molds.

Since our 2004 petition we have examined in detail the origins of the TIN and have formed an even stronger opinion that it is important for the agency to act on this issue now. Following is a summary.

The Tire Identification Number has its origins in a Rubber Manufacturers' Association (RMA) system that preceded the National Highway Safety Bureau rule as the tire identification standard was promulgated. During the 38-year history of this rulemaking, the debates have focused on three main issues: (1) the contents and the purpose of the TIN; (2) its location; and (3) the record keeping associated with matching recalled tires to purchasers. The specific discussions regarding the date of manufacture code have occurred three times: (1) at the standard's inception; (2) in the late 1990s and (3) during the last few years, when the agency sought to overhaul the rule in response to the TREAD Act.

As is the case in many rulemakings, the regulated industry fought hard to shape the regulations. In the past, when tire recalls were relatively rare, and before the problems associated with tire age came to the forefront, tire-makers were successful in keeping the TIN an obscure set of alpha-numeric characters that even some tire sales and service employees couldn't decode. The Ford Explorer-Firestone tire recalls of 2000 and 2001 provided the opportunity for regulators and manufacturers to reexamine the TIN. As the evolution of FMVSS 139 demonstrates, neither has finished the work of making this information accessible so that consumers can fully participate in recalls and make good purchasing and service life decisions.

In 1968, the RMA had devised its own tire identification code, which it presented in a series of meetings, to the U.S. House Finance Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as well as the NHSB. On May 8, 1970, the industry trade group formally petitioned the federal government to adopt its tire identification system.[9] The RMA's proposed system consisted of an 8-9 alphanumeric code that would identify the week of manufacture, the manufacturer and specific plant, the tire size and basic type of construction. The date of manufacture was a two-symbol code devised by the RMA, which required a specially devised key to decipher.[10]

[9] Docket 70-12-No.1-001
[10] Docket 70-12-No.1-001

The federal government had established FMVSS 109 Tire Identification to devise a system in which consumers could be notified of a defective tire in the event of a recall. The NHSB's first proposals did not explicitly outline the consumer's role in the tire recall process. But it is clear from the comments of tire manufacturers that they did not believe the consumer was capable of being, or should be, an active participant. On July 23, 1970, the agency opened Docket 70-12 with its own proposal to develop a standard identification number for tires that would be molded on both sides of the sidewalls.[11] The NHSB proposed a system with four groups of symbols, to be read from left to right. This regulation would replace the manufacturer's assigned code marks under FMVSS 109 and the retreader's code number and retreading date in the label specified under the proposed retreaded tire standard). The first group of symbols would contain the manufacturer's identification mark, which would be assigned by the agency. Manufacturers of new tires would have a two-symbol mark; manufacturers of re-treaded tires would get a three-symbol mark. The second, two-symbol group would identify the size of the tire. The third group, consisting of four symbols, would identify the date of manufacture by week and year. For example, 3171 would mean that the tire was made on the 31st week of 1971. The fourth group would be optional for manufacturers to more precisely describe the tire – product name, load range, number of plies, etc – design features which directly influenced the safety performance or structural integrity of the tire.[12]

The RMA and many of its members were generally outraged that after two years of lobbying, their system was not adopted outright and they complained about every aspect of the proposed rule. On the issue of the date code, many acknowledged that it should be the first group of numbers, since it was important to make most conspicuous the most salient piece of information in identifying a lot of defective tires. Yet some didn't want the customer to be able to interpret the code, think they were capable of reading it, or believe that is was necessary for the consumer to have that information.

BF Goodrich, for example, said that the consumer would be able to identify a recalled tire based on a defect notification letter that would use the entire serial number.[13] Goodyear said that it was questionable that the consumer would be any better able to decipher the bureau's proposed four-digit date code than the RMA's two-digit code.[14] Firestone in particular argued that the bureau should adopt the RMA's two-symbol date code expressly because consumers *couldn't* read it. "Tires are not perishable items," Firestone said in its petition. "Therefore, a conspicuous disclosure of tire age would

[11] Docket 70-12 No. 1; 35FR 11800; July 23, 1970
[12] Docket 70-12 No. 1; 35FR 11800; July 23, 1970
[13] Docket 70-12-No. 1-047; BF Goodrich
[14] Docket 70-12-No.1-036; Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company;

unavoidably introduce into the marketplace a totally artificial measure of quality unrelated to product performance and effectiveness."[15]

In November 1970, the agency published a final rule that adopted some of the public's suggestions, but rejected many others.[16] The agency dropped one of the key measures most vigorously opposed—molding the TIN of both sides of the tires, because of the alleged manufacturing hazard it created. The agency also agreed to drop that part of the proposal, because, it reasoned, under the consumer records part of the proposal, first purchasers of tires would receive notification of defects by certified mail. Under the final rule, the order of the symbol groups was also altered. The first group remained the designation of the tire manufacturer, with makers of new tires having a two-symbol mark; and re-treaded tire makers having a three-symbol mark. The second, two-symbol group would identify the size of the tire. But the final rule switched the third and fourth symbol groups. The third group could be used—except when the tire is a brand name—as an optional descriptive code of design feature, of which the manufacturer would maintain a detailed record, available to the Bureau upon its request (product name, load range, number of plies, etc.). The fourth group—designating the build date of the tire—would now consist of three symbols. The agency dropped the decade position, so that 311 would mean that the tire was made on the 31st week of 1971. The agency said that it shortened the date code and moved it to the last grouping to the last position to make it easier for manufacturers to shorten and change the stencil plate.

The manufacturing date code remained a three-symbol group for 28 years. Then, on October 19, 1998, the agency granted petitions from the RMA and the European Technical Rim and Tyre Organization (ETRTO) requesting that the grouping signifying date of manufacture be expanded from three digits to four digits (as was first proposed in 1970) and that the minimum size of the numbers be reduced from 6 mm to 4 mm.[17] Both organizations argued for the change, in part, to harmonize the U.S. standards with those of the ECE in Europe. The agency agreed that this would help the traceability of defective tires and advance harmonization. On July 8 1999, the agency finalized the rule change and set a July 2, 2000 effective date.[18]

In the post Ford Explorer-Firestone tire rollover period, the efficacy of the TIN and other tire information would re-emerge. On December 19, 2001, the agency published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to establish a new standard to the existing labeling requirements and addressed: the TIN; the tire markings, the vehicle placard content, format, and location as well as owner's manual information. NHTSA proposed

---

[15] Docket 70-12-No.1-076**;** The Firestone Tire & Rubber Company;
[16] Docket 70-12 No. 2; 35FR 17257; November 10, 1970
[17] Docket 1998-4450; 63FR 55863; October 19, 1998
[18] Docket 99-5928; 64FR 36807; July 8, 1999

that the TIN, size designation, maximum permissible inflation pressure and maximum load rating be placed on both sides of light vehicle tires.[19]

In this round of rulemaking, the agency did not solely rely on tire-makers to characterize the knowledge and desires of consumers. Instead, it contracted a series of eight focus groups to determine what consumers knew about tires and safety and what they would like to know. The agency's research, which formed the basis of the proposal, found that consumers were confused by the codes, but wanted to learn more about what they meant. Among the specific findings of the study were:

- No more than one or two study participants had any understanding of more than a little of the information on tires. Some knew that they could find the tire pressure, tire type, weight and brand name. But few had any concept of the full range of information available. And no more than one or two could begin to explain the codes, ratings and other information.[20]

- Most study participants were perplexed by the array of alpha and numeric codes appearing on the demonstration tire. Although they suspected that the codes may hold interesting, even useful, information, none of the persons taking part in this study could identify or describe the meaning of the majority of codes, grades and scores.[21]

- Many want to know what the tire codes and ratings meant. Although some study participants indicated little or no interest in knowing anything more about tires than they already knew, a number expressed a desire to know more about the meaning of the information that appears on tires. Most said they felt it would make them merely better informed consumers.[22]

- Some study participants wish additional information were shown on tires. After they had looked at the information already contained on tires, some suggested that the following information was also displayed: Date of manufacture. Recommended replacement interval.[23]

[19] Docket 2001-11157; 66FR 65536; December 19, 2001
[20] Docket 2001-11157-07; Equals Three Communications; Tire Labeling Focus Group Report; May 14, 2001
[21] IBID
[22] IBID
[23] IBID

- Study participants wished that tire information were presented in "plain language." Since they tended to believe that information provided on tires "is there for a reason," they wished it was displayed in a more understandable format. Codes may be appropriate for the trade, they suggested, but not for consumers.[24]

While this would indicate a clear direction for further refinement of the TIN, the agency stopped far short of moving toward a "plain language" standard. Instead, the agency's major proposals included re-ordering the TIN information and requiring that the information be molded on both sides.

Less than a year after its initial proposal, NHTSA issued a final rule on tire safety information.[25] The final rule dropped the provision to mold the full TIN on both sides of the tire, out of consideration for the manufacturing hazards associated with changing the molds. However, the agency did require the TIN to appear on the "intended outboard sidewall" and either a full or partial TIN (i.e., one without a date code) appear on the inside sidewall. The agency also backed off its proposal to have the TIN reordered and eliminated size and format requirements for the vehicle placard and label.

After tire-makers complained, NHTSA decided to delay the effective date from September 1, 2004 to September 1, 2005 for the vehicle and some tire labeling requirements.[26] More importantly, the agency eliminated the phase-in dates to put the TIN on the intended outward sidewall. Instead, manufacturers would have until September 1, 2009 to ensure that consumers could read the TIN on the outboard side of the tire. This was a concession to tire manufacturers who argued it would cost $224 million to re-work all of the molds. By pushing the date ahead five years, it would give manufacturers time for current molds to wear-out, before their replacement. The requirement to include the partial TIN (minus the date code) on the opposite sidewall was subject to the phase-in schedule, with 100 percent compliance by September 2007.

As the rule stands today, consumers still have to wait three years before they get easier access the TIN. However, consumers are no closer to understanding what these numbers and letters mean. Meanwhile, when manufacturers are reworking their molds to comply with other aspects of FMVSS 139, they could also be incorporating a change in the date of manufacture to a format anyone can understand. Based on the above, we again request that the agency commence rulemaking on tire labeling to include a non-coded date of manufacture on both sidewalls.

[24] IBID
[25] Final Rule; 67FR 69600; Docket 2002-13678; November 18, 2002
[26] Docket 2004-17917; Final Rule; 69FR 31306; June 3, 2004

Undoubtedly, the agency will hear about the alleged high costs and the limited real estate on a sidewall, and that the current TIN already provides the information requested. Tire makers have always played the high cost issue as the trump card. They have mounted this argument throughout the entire TIN rulemaking. However, while the industry is gearing up to place the TIN on both sides, the addition of a month and year instead of a 4-digit code within an alpha-numeric string is a nominal change.

In our prior submissions to the agency on tire aging, we cited German reports from the late-1980s that pointed to the disproportionate increase in failures in tires older than six years. We also cited articles and trade association agreements that clearly demonstrate that the industry recognized tires have a maximum service life, regardless of the remaining tread. Following NHTSA and Ford Motor Company's research, it is now clear that there is agreement that tire age matters and that oven-aging tests can reasonably simulate field aging. Now it's time to take the next step to ensure that consumers can immediately tell when a tire is too old. Easy-to-read expiration dates have long been standard on all sorts of products that deteriorate with age from foods and medicines to rubber washing machine hoses.

Boston Brewing, the company that makes Samuel Adams beers, is an outlier in an industry that, like tire makers, routinely obscured their product's age with arcane codes. In one news article, Jim Koch, the company's founder, observed that the company printed easy to read best-by dates precisely because no store would only have fresh beer: "The last line of defense is consumers," he said.[27] Tire consumers deserve clear, simple tire age information, or, as the agency learned when they surveyed average motorists, they have no defense at all.

In summary:

- Real-world failures that result from aged tires are difficult to identify in publicly available datasets. Incidents that result in litigation tend to represent the most significant severity and injury crashes. The attached list of aged tire incidents is expected to have captured only a small fraction of the real-world incidents that have occurred. Even within the litigation realm, this list is clearly an under-accounting, as there are no over-arching datasets that capture these types of incidents.

- The incidents of aged tire failures underscore the immediate need for policies to alert consumers that tires have service limits beyond obvious and visible tread depth. Safety Research & Strategies has previously urged the agency to

[27] "The Search for Fresh Beer" *The Wall Street Journal*, January 28, 2006, p.1

consider a Consumer Advisory on tire aging— and the Ford Motor Company has supported our request.

- The current date coding contained in the TIN is a consumer unfriendly method for conveying important information that has clearly outlived its usefulness. Regardless of whether the agency decides that "expiration dates" are important, a "born-on date" provides meaningful information for consumers, thus we again request NHTSA to begin rulemaking, separate from tire performance, that would require the date of manufacture molded onto the tire sidewalls as an important interim step toward addressing tire aging issues. This date, in contrast to the current tire identification coding, should be in a format that is readily seen and easily understood by consumers.

Sincerely,

Sean E. Kane

Case Name	Manufacturer	Model	Size	Number	Incident State	Incident City/County	DOT	DOA	Vehicle Yr.	Vehicle Mk.	Vehicle Mdl.	Description	Used Tire	Spare Tire	Injury Total	Fatality Total
Aldridge V. Michelin	Michelin-Uniroyal-Goodrich	BF Goodrich Trail Blazer 2	P205/75R15	1	MI	Ingham County	AUULF3-120	9/4/1999	1990	Geo	Tracker	Original unused spare put into service after the owner had a flat tire. Shortly after owner's father took the vehicle to obtain a new tire for the vehicle (spare had less than 200 miles use), tire experienced a tread separation. Lost control and rolled.		Y	1	
Andersen/Hill	Bridgestone-Firestone	Dueler 684	P245/70R16	2	FL		Made in LaVergne, TN, 45th week of 1998	5/31/2004		Isuzu	Amigo	1998 tire was purchased new in 2003 approximately 1 year prior to our wreck. Tread separation occurred causing Isuzu Rodeo to overturn multiple times.			2	
Antoinette Bell V. Continental Tire	Bridgestone-Firestone	General GT52S	P205/75R15	3	CT	Plainville	Made in 1988	6/29/2002	1988	Ford	Bronco II	Tire was a brand new OE spare put into service when it was 14 years old and suffered a catastrophic tread belt separation within a short period of time. Subsequent loss-of-control rollover.		Y	1	
Ataei-Kachuei v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone	8.75 R 16.5 LT	4	NC	Wake County	EKXK HHD084	10/7/2004	1974	Chevrolet	Truck	Left front tread separation, causing rollover. Tire was sold as new 5/23/02				1
Barnett v. BFS	Bridgestone-Firestone	Firestone	P175/70R13	5	TX	Blanco	H4FHDJE167	8/8/2004	1986	Honda	Accord	Left rear tire separated, driver lost control rotated sideways across a lane and rolled.			1	
Becera	Dunlop	Remington XT 120		6			DHYE45223	1/29/2003	1993	Ford	Aerostar	Tire detreaded, vehicle became uncontrollable and struck a tree.				1
Benivedes V. Michelin-Uniroyal-Goodrich	Michelin-Uniroyal-Goodrich	Uniroyal Laredo	P235/75R15	7	TX		Ardmore, OK plant, 31st week of 1990					The tire was nine years old when it was placed on another vehicle. Subsequent tread separation.				
Blanchard v. Michelin	Michelin	XC LT 4	P235/75R15	8	FL	St. John's	B3DDBUYX294		1997	Ford	Explorer	Four new matching tires were put on the vehicle about 1.5 years prior to the crash. One of the tires was 11 years old at the time. Tread separated on the old tire causing the vehicle to lose control and roll.				1
Brennan/Mizenko v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	FR480	P205/75R15	9	MT	Cascade County	W2ULIML049	8/31/2003	1989	Ford	Bronco II	Vehicle was bought used - had a 1989 FR480 spare on it (vehicle was 12 years old at date of purchase). After being placed into service in the Left rear position, a tread separation occurred, causing rollover. Driver was ejected.		Y	1	
Bush v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	Dueler APT	P255/70R16	10			7BCUPUA438		1999	Ford	Explorer	Bought used from a local mom & pop tire shop. Visual shows adequate tread depth. Four belted occupants, belted front ejected and killed.	Y		2	2?
Byrd v. Bridgestone	Bridgestone	Dueler 684	P245/70R16 106S	11	GA		Y7MT 248 CBJ 248	8/6/2005				Spare tire was placed on rear of car in late July 2005. Tire tread separated, resulting in loss-of-control rollover.		Y	2	0

Cabrera V. Goodyear, Ford	Goodyear	Goodyear Vector	P235/75R15	12	CA	Tulare County	Unknown--Vectors were last made in 1991	8/15/1999	1995	Ford	Explorer	Tread separation on the rear of a 1995 Explorer. Loss-of-control rollover. Tires were discarded by the CHP before a DOT was noted. However, the Vector was last made in 1991. Looking for service records to determine when the tire was put on the vehicle.	Y		4	1
Carver V. Uniroyal	Michelin-Uniroyal-Goodrich	Uniroyal Laredo	LT235/85R16 LRE	13	CA		Made in 1983	1992		GM	Pickup	Tread separation caused driver to lose control.			1	
Castilleja v. BFS	Bridgestone-Firestone	FR480	P225/75R15	14	TX	Hillsboro	W2UU1MX454	12/21/2004	1994	Ford	Explorer	Left rear tread separation causing rollover/roof crush.			1	
Castro v. BFS	Bridgestone-Firestone	FR480	P225/70R15	15	CA	Palm Springs / Riverside	W2UU1MX381	6/10/2003	1992	Ford	Explorer	Tire was supplied as a spare tire at the time of purchase in 9/2001. Tire was put in service 3 days before the accident, which occurred 6/10/03.		Y	2	1
Cheung V. Michelin	Michelin	Uniroyal Tigerpaw	P205/75R15	16	CA	Fresno	APULBB11287	8/11/2002	1996	Nissan	Quest	Tire bought at a Firestone dealer as a spare. Used as a spare in place of the temporary spare. Had a problem with one tire and moved the spare onto the vehicle. Experienced a separation within two weeks. During the separation vehicle became uncontrollable and rolled.		Y		1
Cleworth V. Goodyear	Goodyear	Goodyear		17	FL		Made in 1986	5/15/1997		Mack	Dump Truck	Goodyear truck tire on the left front of a Mack dump truck blew out causing loss-of-control. The vehicle crossed the centerline and struck an oncoming tractor-trailer. The Mack dump truck was in a prior crash and had sat in a salvage facility for a period of time. After the repairs were made the tire failed after 50 miles of service			1	1
Contreras v. BFS	Firestone	Road King Sport SR	P225/70R15	18	CA	Tulare County	W2UUR21316	6/30/2003		Ford	Explorer	Vehicle rolls off road, following a left rear tread separation. Driver fatal (unbelted). The crash occurred in 2003 – 7 year old tire -- 4 to 5 32nds tread depth				1
Crane v. Ford, Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	Firestone FR480	P205/75R15	19	CA	Fresno County	W2UL1ML338.	8/11/2002	1988	Ford	Bronco II	Firestone 480 original spare on right rear, put on shortly before accident, 360-degree tread separation; rollover.		Y		1
Crum v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	FR440	P215/75R15	20	Ontario, Canada	Leeds County	W2HF4FA243	7/31/2002	1993	GMC	Safari	Spare tire was sold by Sunoco station when it 4 years old. Vehicle owned by driver's father. Five years later, five kids travelling in the van when the right front tire experienced a tread separation, but didn't lose air. Was able to drive to a rest stop. Had the spare put on. Bought a new Uniroyal tire, put spare back in the rear. Left rear then detreads. This time vehicle lost control rolled over into an embankment. Tire has less than 30K on it and has 6/32nd tread left.		Y		2

Delphia Bailey v. Rockbusters, Inc.	Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone M844 M1X V-Steel	440/65R22.5	21	TX	Blanco	3CB23HE098	10/2004	1991	Ingersoll-Rand	Drilling Truck	This truck is a drilling rig that sees low mileage. The left from tire failed causing the vehicle to pull left and cross the center line of the highway (it was a two lane non-divided highway) and struck a Ford Explorer at the the A-pillar. Prior to the trip, company had inspected each tires--they showed no signs of cuts, nails, repairs and had ample tread depth. The failure was on the inside sidewall of the left front tire. Expert's initial opinion is that the cause was "rubber fatigue."				1
Englehardt v. BFS	Bridgestone-Firestone	Wilderness	P235/75R15	22	AZ		W2HL 1MO353	7/4/2003	1995	Ford	Explorer	The tire was a spare on a 1995 Ford Explorer. Tire was mounted on vehicle in March 2003. Tread separation occurred on July 4, 2003. Tread depth between 7/32 to 8/32.		Y		
Espericuetta v. Continental Tire	Continental		235/75R15	23			Mt Vernon in 1995		1975	Chevrolet	Van	OE replacement tire for Nissan Pathfinder. Purchased a swap meet--failed one hour after being put into service.			1	
Estate of Acejeune Moise v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	Daytona S-R	P215/65R15	24			VDVF DNA 038		1989	Nissan	Pathfinder	Right rear tire tread separation causing vehicle loss-of-control and rollover. Tire was specifically bought and put on the vehicle either day before or the day of the accident. Sold out of a local mom & pop tire shop.				1
Figueroa	Firestone	ATX	P235/75R15	25	Mexico	Jalisko	353	2/20/2003	1993	Ford	Explorer	Occurred just over the Texas border. Appears that the tire was a spare put into service. History of the tire is unclear. Tire remained inflated after separation.		Y	1	2
Frandsen v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	Triumph	31x10.5R15 LT	26	ID	Elmore County	VD60YWH353	5/3/2002	1990	Dodge	Ram	Right rear tire separation on the Ram, causing it to lose control and strike the plaintiff's vehicle (1995 GMC Jimmy).				1
Frank Longoria v. Cooper Tire	Cooper	Mastercraft Avenger	P225/70R15	27	TX	Grapevine / Tarrant County		4/7/2004	2001	Ford	Ranger	10 year old tire bought at used tire outlet. Placed on Ranger, suffered tread separation 6 months later. Vehicle subsequently rolled, door latch failed and plaintiff was ejected.	Y			1
Garcia v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	Exxon Signature II SR	195/70R14	28	TX	Duval County	W2RWE89421	7/30/2005	1993	Honda	Accord	Vehicle suffered a right rear tread separation, causing it to cross into the opposite oncoming lane, where it was struck by another vehicle. Vehicle was severed in half from the front dashboard forward, and all three occupants were ejected.			1	3
Garcia v. Goodyear	Goodyear	Pathfinder Radial	31x10.50/R16.5	29			PJXBND9V519		1979	Plymouth	Van	Full tread depth. The tire was purchased used from a mom and pop dealer. It was purchased with another tire of same make, model, and DOT. It seems the tires were just stored for a long time. Tire is a 1989.	Y			
Gonzales v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	SF-375	P235/75R15	30	TX	Bexar County	Y7BN DHN 228	7/16/2004	1999	Ford	Explorer	Rear tire tread separation, causing rollover.				1

Hall V. Ford and Continental-General	Continental-General	General GT52S	P205/75R15	31	GA	Talapoosa	A3UL42H407	8/5/1996	1988	Ford	Bronco II	Tire was an unused spare on the rear of a Bronco II. It was 9 years old when first put into service. Catastrophic tread separation occurred after it was driven less than 1,000 miles--led to rollover.		Y		1
Heather Keeney V. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	Firestone FR480	P205/75R15	32	OH	Rossford		6/15/2002	1988	Ford	Bronco II	Original spare tire on a 1988 Bronco II was put into service about two months before the failure. Tire failed causing a loss-of-control rollover.		Y	2	
Hernandez v. Ford/Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	Firestone ATX	P235/75R15	33	Mexico	2 miles over the TX boarder at Progresso	VNHL IMO 163	8/12/2001	1993	Ford	Explorer	Original spare was put on and subsequently suffered a separation. The vehicle was purchased through an auction during the recall. Sold with the OE spare which was never replaced.		Y	4	1
Hill V. Ford, BFS	Bridgestone-Firestone	Firestone 721	P205/75R15	34	FL		VNUL1HE087	6/16/2000	1987	Ford	LTD	Tire was an unused spare on a 1987 Ford LTD Country Squire station wagon. Spare was put on after tire on the right rear started "thumping." Tread separation occurred after one day in service.		Y	1	
Howard, et al. V. Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	ATX		35	SC		W2UL1ML458	8/5/2001	1989	Ford	Bronco II	Right rear tire came apart causing the driver to lose control; vehicle rolled over. Tire was original issue and had never been used before. Tread was good, but once tire failed it appeared to have dry rot.		Y	3	1
Howeedy V. Bridgestone-Firestone, et al	Bridgestone-Firestone	Firestone FR410	P215/75R15	36	FL	Oceoala	VDMO41A477	3/21/2004	1992	Ford	Windstar	Tire purchased used from a tire dealer just prior to the crash with 8/32nds tread depth, no repairs or punctures. Tread separation after two months in service.	Y		1	2
Jackson V. Continental Tire	Continental-General	Grabber ST	P235/70R15	37	AZ	Maricopa County	ADM1 2WH 036	8/10/2003	1996	Nissan	Pathfinder	Left rear tire separated, causing loss of control and subsequent rollover.			2	1
Jackson V. Goodyear	Goodyear	Goodyear Wrangler	P235/75R15	38			M6HL-FNHR-132	7/30/2000	1997	Ford	Explorer	Tread separation resulted in a loss-of-control rollover. Vehicle was being driven by the owner's mother.			1	
Janssen v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	ATX II	P235/75R15	39	AR	Franklin County	VNHL1MO124	5/29/2004	1994	Ford	Explorer	OE spare was put into service. Tread separation resulted in a single vehicle rollover crash.		Y	3	
Jones V. Cooper	Cooper Tire	Cooper Discoverer Radial AST	31x10.5 R15LT	40	UT	St. George / Washington	UT60CXW234	3/2/2001	1998	Toyota	Pickup	Tread separation causing loss-of-control.				1
Josan Hicks V. Dunlop/Goodyear, Toyota, et al	Dunlop	Grand Trek	P265/70R16	41	CA	San Bernadino	DB72A16376	7/6/2003	1997	Toyota	4Runner	Driver and son were moving from Florida to California. Prior to trip, Toyota dealer rotated the unused OE spare onto the right rear three weeks prior. Tread belt separation occurred causing loss-of-control and rollover.		Y		1
Katrina Owens V. Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	Firehawk SS	P235/60R15	42	AL	Crenshaw County	W2VL FH5 094	2/22/2001	1980	Oldsmobile	Delta 88	Replacement tire on an Olds Delta 88. Left front tread separation caused a loss-of-control while travelling at about 60 mph. Vehicle T-boned an ambulance. Tire made in 1994, sold in 1999.				3

Keddington v. Michelin	Michelin-Uniroyal-Goodrich	BF Goodrich Trailmaker	P235/75R15	43	UT	Beaver County UT on I15. Mile 113	BEHLWF0386	7/8/2001	1995	Chevrolet	Blazer	Vehicle was travelling at highway speed when the right rear tire separated. The vehicle went off the road and rolled and struck a Dodge van. Tire was inspected by a tire dealer less than one month prior to the crash. 8/32nds of tread depth left--no punctures or other damage.			1	1
Kelly v. Land Rover, et al.	Continental-General	Ameri 550 AS	P235/70 R16	44	CA	San Bernadino	A308443258	3/18/2004	1995	Land Rover	Discovery	Right rear tread separation causing loss-of-control and rolled over approx. five turns			1	
Kiney/Tucker V. Ohtsu	Ohtsu	Ohtsu		45	MD		1984	4/12/1996	1991	Mazda	MPV	Tire was purchased used and placed on the vehicle in 1996. Tread separation occurred, vehicle became uncontrollable and rolled.	Y		1	
Ladson v. Bridgestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	Dueler	P245/70R16	46	FL	Duval	Y7MTCBJ138	11/16/2004	1999	Isuzu	Amigo	This was a 6-year-old tire that had been the spare and had approximately 15,000 miles on it before the crash. It was the left rear tire		Y		1
Lewis v. Cooper	Cooper	Starfire Flite Line IV	P205/70 R15 M+S	47	FL	Lee	U9MO85E 479	8/8/2004	1999	Mercury	Villager	Tire looked almost brand new - perhaps a spare				1
Martin v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	ATX	P235/75R15	48	FL					Ford				Y		
Martinez v. BFS	Bridgestone-Firestone	Desert Dueler	33x12.5x15	49	CA	San Diego County	EJFUCFN240	7/11/2003	1990	Ford	Bronco	Right rear tire tread separation, causing loss-of-control and subsequent rollover.			1	
Mateo V. Cooper	Cooper	Cornell 700 HT	P215/75R15	50	AZ	Casa Grande / Pinal	UTHBB73497, Texarkana plant	7/25/1998	1991	Ford	Aerostar	1991 Ford Aerostar. Right rear tire tread separation causing driver to lose control. Vehicle left the road and rolled.				1
Maxwell v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	Radial Baja Widetrack LRE	LT235/85R16	51	KS	Salina	VD0RW1C076	6/13/2003	1991	Ford	15-Passenger Club Van	Church van loaded with 13 passengers plus cargo, towing a single-axle U-Haul trailer. Left rear tire detreaded, causing loss-of-control and rollover.				1
McGuire V. Dunlop Tire, Sumitomo Rubber	Sumitomo	Dunlop SP4N		52	FL		Made in 1986	3/16/1996		MG	Midget	Tires were on a MG Midget that was driven infrequently. Vehicle owner's brother was driving the vehicle when the left rear tire experienced a tread separation. The driver lost control of the vehicle but was able to maneuver it to the shoulder; however a semi-truck attempting to avoid the vehicle struck the MG.			1	
Miller V. Cooper, Ford	Cooper	Patriot Ultra Supreme 775	P235/75R15	53	FL		15th week of 1992	3/29/2001	1996	Ford	Explorer	Tread separation, loss-of-control rollover.				1
Mimmitt v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	ATX	P235/75R15	54	MS		W2HL-IMO-334	5/13/2006	1998	Mercury	Mountaineer	Appears that tire was bought secondhand. Right rear tread separation, causing rollover. Four of the nine occupants were ejected.			7	2

Moreno v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	ATX	P235/75R15	55	CA	Riverside County	VDHL 1MO 254	5/24/2006	1994	Ford	Explorer	The vehicle was found with three Goodyear tires (right front, left front and right rear) and only one Firestone ATX on the left rear. There was no spare tire on the vehicle. The DOT number indicates the tire was made several months prior to the vehicle build date--likely the spare.		Y		1
Moreno v. Continental	Continental-General	Ameri-Tech ST	P205/70R15 95S	56	FL	Kissimmee / Osceola County	A3 MO FFA 253	4/15/2002	1992	Oldsmobile	Royale	General Tire & Rubber Co. plant in Mount Vernon, IL 25th week of 1993. Tread separated, causing vehicle to cross into oncoming traffic, striking another vehicle and seriously injuring that occupant.			2	2
Munoz V. Bridgestone-Firestone, Ford	Bridgestone-Firestone	Firestone ATX	P235/75R15	57	TX	Near Brady, TX	Made in 1993	4/12/2002	1993	Mazda	Navajo	Tire was a slightly used OE spare on an Explorer. Put into service within two weeks, suffered catastrophic tread belt separation. Resulted in a loss-of-control rollover		Y	1	
Murillo V. Michelin, General Motors	Michelin-Uniroyal-Goodrich	Uniroyal Laredo LT	235/85R16	58			ANORB01105	7/10/2002	1986	Chevrolet	Sierra Classic Pickup	Tire experienced a tread separation within about 15,000 miles of service.			2	2
Northview Fire Dept	Goodyear		385/65R22.5	59	NC	Northview	1991	2004	1992	Fire Truck		Right front tire was original on fire truck. Travelling back from a fire tire separated (vehicle governed at 65 mph), took 600 feet to stop the vehicle--no crash. [Failed tire and companion being shipped to SRS]				
Oates V. Cooper	Cooper Tire	Cooper Lifeliner Classic M/S	P225/70R15	60	AR	Hope	U9UUCU9293	8/14/2002	1995	GMC	Safari	Tire purchased by a former Cooper tire employee at a Cooper company store in 1996 in Texarkana. Tire was intended for a classic car that was being restored. Tires were mounted on the vehicle which was stored on jacks. At some point the tire was removed and stored in a garage and mounted on a GMC van--about 8 months prior to the crash (set of 4). First separation occurred on a rear tire, no crash. This tire was brought to Cooper, who replaced it for $1.50 as it had virtually no wear. Second failure occurred on the left rear and resulted in a loss of control crash.			1	2
Owens v. Michelin	Michelin	Uniroyal Tigerpaw	235/75R15	61	OK	Wheeler	ANHLHU11247	3/16/2005	1997	Ford	Explorer	The spare tire was rotated onto the right rear of the vehicle earlier in the day of the crash. The vehicle was travelling on the highway with 5 occupants when the right rear tire suffered a tread belt separation causing the driver to lose control. Vehicle rolled and all occupants were ejected (unbelted). Police report notes the spare tire was "dry rotted"--need more information.				2

Payan V. Ford, Continental-General	Continental-General	General Ameri 550	P235/70R16	62	Mexico	Coahuila	A308443417	7/17/2004	1998	Ford	F-150	Tire had 80% or its tread left when a separation occurred. Loss-of-control and rollover followed	Y		1	
Pena V. Continental General, Nissan	Continental-General	General Ameri-trac	P235/75R15	63	NC		A3HL27V236	9/00/2000	1987	Nissan	Pickup	Tire was an unused spare on a 1987 Nissan Pickup. Was put into service and suffered a tread separation after one day of use. Vehicle lost control and rolled. Belted driver was in a coma for two weeks and was rendered a paraplegic.		Y	1	
Peralta V. All Weather Tire Sales, Ohtsu, et al	Ohtsu	Falken		64	NY		Tire made in July 1988	1995	1994	Mazda	MPV	Tire was purchased new from a small retailer and put on the car in March 1994. Tread separation			1+	1
Pomering v. Michelin	Michelin	BF Goodrich Longtrail	P245/75R16	65	AZ	Pinal County	AP701ILI I296	1/24/2003	1983	Chevrolet	Pickup	Tire was 7 years old (in Phoenix) on an old pickup truck that was bought by the claimant--the subject tire was on the vehicle when purchased with 11/32nds tread. Left front tread separation causing vehicle to swerve into opposing lane of traffic, hitting another vehicle head-on.			2	1
Prenger V. BFS	Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone Dueler	P24570R16	66	GA	Turner County	EJMTJMM072	5/00/2002	1992	Isuzu	Trooper	Original spare tire suffered catastrophic tread separation shortly after being put into service. Vehicle became uncontrollable and rolled.		Y	1	
Prince V. Michelin	Michelin-Uniroyal-Goodrich	Michelin Radial X	P215 75R/15	67	MO	Saline County		6/26/1998	1988	Jeep	Cherokee	OE spare was put into service. Tread separation resulted in a single vehicle rollover crash.		Y		1
Proctor V. Kumho	Kumho	Marshall Steel Belted Radial 771	195/70R14	68	FL	Lake Mary / Seminole County	YOJ9YA1Y374	8/11/2001	1983	Mercedes	300D	Replacement tires were on the vehicle when it was purchased. Tread spearated causing loss-of-control rollover crash.				1
Racca v. Goodyear	Goodyear	Wrangler HT	LT225/75R16	69	LA	Iberville	MKIL26223	6/18/2000	1997	Isuzu	Rodeo	Rear tire tread separation causing loss-of-control and rollover.			2	
Ramos V. Goodyear	Goodyear	Kelly Springfield Turbo-Tech GT	P275/60R15	70	PA	Berks County	PJR7VAJ278	10/2/2003	1983	Ford	E150	Right rear tread separation causing loss of control. Vehicle crossed into oncoming traffic where it was struck on the passenger side be a Chevy pick-up. Tire made in Fayeteville, NC in 1988. Tire was on the vehicle when he purchased the vehicle used in 1998. Infrequently used vehicle.			1	3
Rios V. Goodyear	Goodyear	Kelley Safari AWR	P215/75R15	71	TX		PJHSKACR141	4/29/2000	1994	Mazda	MPV	Tire was 10 years old at the time of the accident and found with 60 percent of its tread depth at the time of separation.				1
Rivira	Yokohama	Medallist Radial A/S		**72**	TX	Bexar County	CCHCVEA200	6/11/2003	1988	Plymouth	Voyager	Travelling on I35, Left rear tread separation, loss-of-control rollover				1

Rocco V. Cooper	Cooper	Hercules Terra Trac	33x12.5R16.5 LT	73	AZ		UPXFHKX3882, 38th week of '92, Findlay, OH	8/15/1999	1966	International	Crew-Cab pickup	1966 International Crew Cab pickup. Plaintiff was operating the vehicle when the left front tire experienced a tread/belt separation causing her to lose control of the vehicle, which left the roadway. Vehicle was used very infrequently.			1	
Rodriguez/Reyes v. Yokohama Tire	Yokohama	Yokohama All Season 370G	P205/75R14	74	TX	Jim Wells County	FDREMLN492	3/10/2002	1990	Ford	Aerostar	Tire was on the vehicle when the vehicle was purchased used. Origins unknown.			1	2
Rowan V. BFS, Ford	Bridgestone-Firestone	Firestone FR480	P205/75R15	75	FL	Titusville / Brevard	VD1ML019	2/19/1999	1989	Ford	Bronco II	Original spare tire was put into service on a 1989 Bronco II and suffered a catastrophic tread separation within 2 weeks of operation (approximately 4,000 - 6,000 miles of total use). Traffic Homicide report noted that the tire looked new.		Y		1
Sanchez v. Michelin	Michelin-Uniroyal-Goodrich		235/75R15	76	TX	Shamrock	ANHLHU11247	2/16/2005	1997	Ford	Explorer	Right rear tire (spare with dry rot) tread separation causing loss-of-control, rolled over approx. 5 times. All 5 occupants ejected.		Y	3	2
Sanders v. Michelin	Michelin	BF Goodrich Radial Long Trail T/A	P225/75 R16	77	FL		AP71HI1147	8/29/2004	1997	Isuzu	Rodeo	The tire looks to be a spare. Failed after 3 months of use.		Y		
Schifo	Continental General	General Ameri-Star 300SL	P205/75R14	78	CA	San Bernadino	Mt. Vernon 1993 (Full DOT illegible)	1/2/2002	1999	Ford	Ranger	Right rear tire tread separation, causing loss of control and subsequent rollover. Driver ejected.			1	
Scifres v. Michelin	Michelin	BFGoodrich Radial Long Trail	R15	79	OK		ANHLHU11379	5/20/2005	1997	Ford	Explorer	Tread Separation leading to rollover.				2
Scudera V. BFS, Ford, Fuzzies, et al.	Bridgestone-Firestone	ATX	P235/75R15	80	FL	Miami Dade	1992 tire	6/2/2004	1993	Ford	Explorer	Vehicle was purchased in Feb. 2002. Purchased four new tires, tire dealer advised that the spare tire was in good condition, no need to replace. Spare was put into service following a flat, appears to have been an OE spare tire. 11/32nds tread depth. Tread separation after two days in service caused a loss-of-control rollover.		Y		1
Selling V. Continental-General	Continental-General	Continental GT 8000	P195/60R14	81	TX	Near Wichita Falls	ACR43EW407	7/29/2002	1990	Acura	Integra	Tire separated (remained inflated), resulted in a loss-of-control rollover.			1	
Shinhoster V. BFS, Ford	Bridgestone-Firestone	Seiberling	P235/75R15	82	AL		VDHLT3A463	6/11/2000		Ford	Explorer	Tire was purchased used in May 2000 for a spare. Was put into service shortly after. Tire failed with nearly 9/32nds tread depth.	Y			1
Siaw v. Continental Tire	Continental	Contitrac AT	P255/75R17	83	Ghana	West Africa	AD9C448357	3/18/2003	1998	Ford	Lincoln Navigator	The vehicle was shipped directly to Ghana, West Africa where the vehicle and the tires were stored in the client's enclosed garage. The vehicle would be used approx. 2-3 months out of the year (vehicle mileage was 21,479). On DOA, driver's side rear tire lost its tread, causing loss-of-control and rollover.			1	
Squires v. Michelin	Michelin	Sport King Radial A/T Medalist	32x11.50R15 LT	84	MS	Rankin County	BEYK TPJ 428	8/12/2004	1984	Chevrolet	Blazer	Tire was four years old when it was sold new. Right rear tread separation at 6 years.				1

Stevens / Kellermeyer v. Ford, BFS et al.	Bridgestone-Firestone	FR480	P205/75R15	85	SC	Camden	HYUL80A347	8/1/2002	1988	Ford	Bronco II	Left rear tire suffered tread separation, causing vehicle to strike guardrail and rollover.			1	1
Teamer v. Michelin	Michelin	BF Goodrich Trail Maker	P225/75R15	86	MI	Perry County	BHHHL01328	7/1/2000	1993	Chevrolet	Astro	Tire was manufactured in 1988 and was a used tire sold from a Discount Tire Store in Battle Creek, MI. Left right tire blew out causing loss-of-control and rollover.	Y		6	2
Tellez v. Pirelli	Pirelli	Sears Guardsman Rsponse XL	P205/75R15	87	CA	Riverside	CKUL24C452	8/17/2002	1993	Ford	Astro Van	Traveling at about 80 mph, right rear tread separation. Yawed left, went into the center divider, tripped and rolled. Two ejections. Believes that the tire was a spare (Madison, TN factory).		Y	1	1
Townsend	Pirelli	Pirelli P4	165R13	88	MO		XPE9XJJX347	7/11/1999	1965	Sunbeam	Tiger	Tires were put on a restored Tiger that was stored on blocks and rarely used. The 11 year old tires had about 4,000 miles in service when one experienced catastrophic tread separation. Led to loss-of-control rollover.				1
Unknown	Michelin	Michelin		89	Scotland		Made in 1987	2001		Peugot	205	Tire was put on a Peugot 205 by a Kwik Fit service center (owned by Ford) and was 14 years old at the time. Tread belt separation occurred, driver lost control and hit a minibus.			?	
Valdovinos V. Michelin	Michelin	Challenger Regul Sport	P275/60R15	90			BER7N7HH488		1996	Ford	Explorer	Tire was purchased used. Tread separation, loss-of-control rollover.	Y		1	
Vera v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	ATX	P235/75R15	91	FL	Orlando	VHHL 1PB 284	5/8/2005	1996	Ford	Explorer	Appears to be an OE spare. Right rear tire tread separation, causing rollover. Four of the five occupants were ejected.		Y	4	1
Viel V. Kumho	Kumho	Marshal	P175/80R13	92	FL	Daytona Beach	H2AU YPO 484	8/29/1999	1994	Toyota	Tercel	Left right tread separation causing vehicle to fishtail across the median, where it was struck on the right-side passenger door by another vehicle			1	2
Vigil v. Michelin	Michelin	BFGoodrich Touring T/A Tubeless Radial	P20570R14	93	TX	El Paso		5/6/2004	1956	Chevrolet	Bel Air	11 year-old tire purchased 10 years ago. Uncle bought tire and maintained receipts--from Pep Boys. Car sat in garage. 8/32nds on tire, no visual signs of deterioration. Gives them to a relative to put on a 56 Chevy--gets inspected 2 months prior to accident. Right front tread separation causing loss-of-control and subsequent rollover. Driver and front passenger ejected.			3	
Ward-Lowery v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	FR440	P235/75R15	94	MS	Quitman	HYHL4FA248	4/14/2004	1998	Chevrolet	Suburban	Used tire, which was purchased on 1/23/2004 from a dealer, suffered a left rear tread separation on 04/14/2004 causing rollover, driver ejected.	Y			1

Wiest V. Bridgestone-Firestone	Firestone	FR721	P215/75R15	95	AZ	Fredonia / Mohave	HYIIFF77033	6/27/2000	1995	Ford	Ranger	Truck was purchased from an auto auction in Salt lake City on 5/19/00 and was sold with a Firestone 721 full-size spare. The tire had almost full tread and showed no visible signs of deterioration. Sometime between the 5/19/00 and 6/27/00 the spare was mounted on the left rear. Tread separation occurred and led to loss-of-control rollover. Unbelted driver ejected		Y		1
Wilkenson V. BFS	Firestone	Firehawk SS10		96	WY	Albany County	1995	8/21/2003	1978	Ferrari	308 GTB	Left rear tread separation causing loss-of-control and rollover. Victim ejected. The 8-year-old tires were purchased with the car 9 days earlier from a Wyoming doctor who rarely used the vehicle.				1
Williams	Michelin-Uniroyal-Goodrich		P235/75R15	97	FL	Suwannee County	APHLF3U052	2/8/2002	1992	Ford	Explorer	Tread separation on a 1992 Explorer caused loss-of-control and rollover. Tire had 11/32nds tread depth when it failed.				1
Williams et al, V. Pirelli/Armstrong, Sears	Pirelli-Armstrong	Sears Ice & Snow Roadhandler	P215/75R15	98	FL	Alachua	CKHF2FC376	5/18/2001	1998	Ford	Windstar	Experienced a flat tire while travelling on the highway. Purchased the subject tire used from a gas station. After completing the trip, the vehicle was inspected by a tire dealer who indicated the tires were fine. Drove on the tire for about two months before it experienced a tread separation (right rear). At the time of the failure the tire had an approximately 7/32nds. The vehicle became uncontrollable and rolled.	Y		6	1
Williams v. Bridgestone	Bridgestone	Dueler	P245/70R16	99	FL		Y7MTCBJ088	6/14/2005	1998	Isuzu	Rodeo	Left rear tread and outer steel belt separation. The tire was the original equipment spare that was mounted on an exterior bracket on the rear of the vehicle. Approx. 2 weeks before the accident, the tire was removed from the spare position and placed on the left rear of the vehicle. On the morning of the accident the vehicle had a full service inspection, including a check of all tires, and got the all-clear.		Y	1	
Wilson V. Yokohama; Turner V. Yokohama; GM	Yokohama (Mohawk)	Mohawk		100	MO	Wright City / Warren County	1984 [NEED Full DOT] Defendants claim the tire was made in Salem VA plant in 1984	7/11/2002	1970	Chevrolet	C10	Unused Mohawk tires were purchased second-hand at a car swap meet and stored for several years before being mounted on a 1970 Chevy C-10 Pickup truck. With more than 50% of the tread left, experienced a tread separation. Driver lost control crossed a median and struck another vehicle. Truck burst into flames.				2
Young v. Cooper	Cooper	Courser	LT245/75R16	101			UP11BTU453	8/31/2001				Tire failure caused driver loss-of-control, resulting in collision.				1
Zamora v. Cooper	Cooper	Sumitomo SC990 A/S	P235/75R15	102	TX	Charlotte	UTHLWRA- 41-	8/8/2004	1993	Ford	Explorer	Left rear tread separation causing rollover. Two ejections, including driver.			5	
Zapalac v. Bridgestone-Firestone	Bridgestone-Firestone	ATX	LT 31x10.5R15	103			VD 1990		1974	Ford	Bronco	Vehicle was purchased in 2005 - after a restoration. Had four 1990 ATX tires --several months after purchase experienced a tread separation. Rollover ensued.			1	

Zarzaur	Bridgestone-Firestone	Firestone FR480	P215/75R15	104	AL		W2HF1MM149	9/3/2003	1997	Chevrolet	Astro	Tires were replaced by a Firestone dealer on a 1997 Chevy Astro van on 8/19/2002 with FR480s. Within one year three of the tires experienced tread separations, two causing significant vehicle damage. Two tires were returned to Firestone Corp. following the claim procedure--Firestone denied the claim and noted that the tires were made in 1989 and should not be in service.			0	0
Zuniga v. Michelin	Michelin	BFGoodrich Excentia GT	P205/60R15 90T M+S	105	MX	Matehuala	AN UN NC 11 488	4/10/2005	2002	Chrysler	PT Cruiser	Right rear tire separation, causing loss-of-control and subsequent rollover.			2	
	Bridgestone	Dueler		106			Made in LaVergne, TN, 1998		1998	Isuzu	Amigo	Had three replacement tires, original spare was rotated into service. Tread separation occurred shortly after the incident causing a loss-of-control and rollover.		Y		
	Michelin			107	UK		28th week of 1987	5/28/2001	1990	Peugeot	205	14 year-old Peugeot 205, was involved in a collision with a minibus when one of the tires suffered a "blow-out" and the driver lost control of the vehicle. The vehicle had been purchased by the insured on September 3, 1999. The tire that suffered a blow-out had previously been fitted by a tire fitter at Kwik-Fit (a company owned by the Ford Motor Group) in March 2001. It had been stored as the spare when the car was purchased . The date of manufacture of the tire is the 28th week of 1987 and was therefore nearly 14 years old when fitted.		Y	10	
	Michelin	Maple Leaf M+S DEFENDER SRX+4RADIAL 60s	P235/60R14	108			BH RI N 74 392	9/22/2004				Made by Uniroyal Goodrich at Kitchener, Ontario in week 39 of 1992. The tire was sold in August 2004 by a tire dealer in Imperial, California. Full tread separation.				1
										TOTALS					115	85