

FORD PINTO CASE STUDY ANSWERS

FORD PINTO OUTLINE – *INTRODUCTION* – *STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM OF THE CASE* – *CASE ANALYSIS* – *CASE RESOLUTION* The Ford Pinto is a . the other alternative solution that study will give longer time Pinto Model and take .

A defect can take three forms: a defect in design as was alleged against the Ford Motor Company , a defect in manufacture, or a defect in warning. In fact, the lobbying efforts were so strong that negotiations continued until , despite studies showing that hundreds of thousands of cars burned every year, taking 3, lives annually; the adoption of the standard was projected to reduce the death rate by 40 percent. Put yourself in the role of the recall coordinator for Ford Motor Co. By stating that absent a "gift of prophecy the defendant could not have predicted the point upon the route where such an accident would occur," Judge Cardozo indicated that giving every possibility the ultimate amount of protection would be too costly compared to the risk of injury.

Introduction When defendants were found liable for only intentional harms, these harms fell under the category of absolute liability. First and foremost, companies' manufacturing operations are the party in control of the product from its inception. Some have argued the prosecution acted unethically from day one, gathering and hiding evidence from the defendant and concealing information about the condition of the van driver. A tug, the "Carroll," owned by the Carroll Towing Company attempted to move from one barge in the same area to another. If the cost was larger than the expected harm, the defendant was not expected to take the precaution. The company said that it had been cheating on its mileage tests for a quarter-century and that all models in its domestic lineup were affected. Thus, to be competitive with foreign manufacturers, Ford felt it could not spend any money on improving the gas tank. The trend moved toward placing the burden on society in instances where the benefit outweighed the risk or the risk was less than the cost to avoid it. Petrie, 21 the court stated that "damages must appear to be the legal and natural consequences arising from the tort. Moreover higher costs for settlement might happen if the filed cases are not handled well by the lawyers of Ford.

Introduction In May of , the Ford Motor Company, based upon a recommendation by then vice-president Lee Iacocca, decided to introduce a subcompact car and produce it domestically. However, just because it was legal doesn't necessarily mean that it was ethical. In the decision, Chief Justice Shaw acknowledged moving away from this traditional distinction and to consideration of whether a harm was "willful, intentional, or careless. Text of Paper Abstract

The cases involving the explosion of Ford Pinto's due to a defective fuel system design led to the debate of many issues, most centering around the use by Ford of a cost-benefit analysis and the ethics surrounding its decision not to upgrade the fuel system based on this analysis. Ford was aware of the problem with the gas tank leaking and could have changed it before others died from their mistakes. These three Pintos did not leak fuel because special measures had been taken to prevent fuel leaks. Despite knowing the defect and owning a patent of a much safer gas tank they continued with the production because the assembly line-machinery was already tooled when engineers. Under normal conditions, chassis design, styling, product planning, advance engineering, component testing, and so on were all either completed or nearly completed prior to tooling of the production factories. The moral issues about the Ford Pinto is that they take their profit is more important than human life. Because of these numerous design flaws, the Pinto became the center of public debate. The first step in finding this middle ground in manufacturing liability cases was to remove requirements of warranty and privity of contract that manufacturers used to escape liability in the past. Ford did not give equal consideration to the interests of each affected party. It is difficult to understand how a price can be put on saving a human life. Facts A. Therefore when the fuel tank issue was discovered, it was too costly to redesign the product. There were a number of reasons why this type of finding was unfair. Suppose Ford officials were asked to justify their decision. Manufacturing divisions have a chance to monitor design and distribution and therefore seems the logical party to be held liable if the design of its product leads to an injury. The Ordinary Care Standard In the mid s, courts began the evolution of moving away from what they once considered an important decision--whether a harm was a result of an action "on trespass" or a harm as a result of an action "on the case. Finally, it provides a bright line which companies can follow.