DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17164235

Case Report

Technical Glitch Culminated in a Fatal Fire Event – A case report

Ashwinikumar[1], Shankar M Bakkannavar[2] 0000-0001-6599-7014

Abstract:
Technological advancements are intended to enhance the quality of life. A primary application of technology pertains to individual comfort and security. However, there are instances when such technology may malfunction, leading to dire consequences. This article presents an uncommon case in which a middle-aged couple was awakened under the guise of a fire alarm but was unable to escape the flames and toxic gases, ultimately succumbing to the peril. The evidence gathered at the crime scene and the conditions surrounding the deceased couple is analyzed comprehensively.
The occurrence of suffocation and death by fire is frequently observed in fire-related events, where victims may fall prey to carbon monoxide inhalation prior to the flames reaching them. This unfortunate situation underscores the twofold mechanisms of mortality: thermal injuries and asphyxiation. A thorough understanding of these processes is vital for forensic inquiries and preventive measures. The mitigation of thermal injuries and asphyxiation necessitates a comprehensive strategy that encompasses education, safety apparatus, and technological advancements. Implementing effective strategies can greatly diminish the risks linked to heat exposure and suffocation. Although these preventive measures are essential, challenges persist in guaranteeing their widespread adoption and efficacy, particularly in environments with a high risk of such incidents.

Keywords: Thermal injuries; Suffocation; technical glitch; preventive measures; comprehensive strategy

Introduction:

Accidental residential fires are a significant safety concern, often resulting in fatalities that could potentially be prevented. The investigation of such incidents reveals common risk factors and preventive measures that could mitigate these tragedies. Key findings from various studies highlight the demographics most at risk, the typical causes of these fires, and the effectiveness of safety measures. These insights are crucial for understanding how accidental fires can lead to fatalities and what can be done to prevent them.

A study in Alberta found that males and seniors, i.e., 65 years and older, are more frequently victims of accidental residential fire deaths. Alcohol consumption was prevalent among nearly half of the decedents, and smoke inhalation was the leading cause of death.[1] Fatal fires were more common in small population centers and rural areas, often occurring during the winter season and between midnight and 6 a.m. Smoking materials were identified as the leading source of ignition.[1] Autopsy evaluations can be challenging due to the destruction of evidence, but they are crucial for determining whether the death was accidental or if foul play was involved.[2]

[1] Associate Professor, [2] Professor & Head, Department of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology, Kasturba Medical College, Manipal, Karnataka 576104.
Correspondence: Dr. Ashwinikumar
Email: kumar.ashwini@manipal.edu
Contact: +919964139484

Received on 25.03.2025 | Accepted on 11.05.2025

The burden is often exacerbated by structural vulnerabilities and increasing reliance on home automation systems. Fire-related mortality frequently results from a combination of thermal injury and inhalation of toxic gases, particularly carbon monoxide (CO).[3] CO poisoning contributes significantly to fire-related deaths by inducing neurological incapacitation, rendering escape impossible even in alert individuals.[4] In house fires, deaths often result from inhalation of combustion products, primarily carbon monoxide, which can be fatal even at lower concentrations in individuals with underlying health issues.

Case Details

The couple resided in a modern home equipped with a centralized AC system and an automated, remote-controlled main door designed for enhanced security. In the early morning hours, a fire broke out in a private residence occupied by a middle-aged couple. According to eyewitness accounts, neighbors observed smoke emanating from the house and promptly attempted to alert the sleeping occupants. Despite these efforts, the couple was unable to evacuate. Emergency services arrived shortly thereafter. The husband died at the scene, while the wife succumbed en route to the hospital.

Figure 1: Husband's burn injury – front and back

Figure 2: Wife's burn injury – front and over left lower limb

Figure 3: Crime Scene pictures

Postmortem Examination

The autopsy of both victims revealed significant external burn injuries. The husband had sustained burns over 65% of the total body surface area (TBSA), while the wife had sustained burns covering 50% TBSA. Cherry-red postmortem lividity was observed in both cases, a classic indicator of CO poisoning[5]. Cyanosis was present, notably in the nail beds and lips. Internally, the trachea and terminal bronchioles of both individuals contained soot particles, confirming that the fire was inhaled while they were still alive. These findings were consistent with antemortem smoke inhalation and supported the diagnosis of asphyxia secondary to CO intoxication. All the organs were congested.

Toxicological Analysis

Arterial blood gas (ABG) analysis conducted postmortem revealed elevated levels of carboxyhemoglobin. The husband's COHb level was recorded at 54.7%, while the wife's was 42.3%. These values significantly exceed the threshold of 40%, which is typically associated with severe central nervous system dysfunction, incapacitation, and fatal outcomes.[6,7] High COHb levels, in the presence of cherry-red lividity and soot in the airways, confirmed that both individuals were alive during the fire and succumbed, in part, due to toxic gas inhalation.

Cause of Death

The official cause of death for both individuals was certified as "Complications secondary to extensive burn injuries sustained." The temporal sequence of findings suggests that the victims were rendered unconscious or physically incapacitated due to high COHb levels before the thermal injuries became fatal. CO intoxication likely impaired cognitive and motor function, thereby preventing escape despite being alerted by neighbors.

Crime Scene Investigation

The origin of the fire was initially unclear. Smoke detection systems were analyzed to determine response time and function.[8] Surveillance video footage from neighboring properties was reviewed to assist in establishing the timeline and progression of the fire. Although metallographic and thermal residue analyses were employed to trace potential electrical failures or accelerants, these yielded inconclusive results. Subsequently detailed examination identified the air conditioning (AC) unit as the likely origin of the fire. It was determined that gradual ignition of synthetic materials within and around the unit, including plastic components, led to sustained combustion and CO release. The centralized AC system, lacking adequate emergency ventilation pathways, facilitated rapid CO accumulation within the enclosed space. Compounding the problem was the failure of the remote-operated main door, which malfunctioned due to thermal damage to its circuitry. This mechanical failure effectively trapped the couple inside, despite the house being structurally intact for a considerable duration before full fire engulfment.

Discussion

This case exemplifies the synergistic lethality of thermal burns and CO intoxication in enclosed residential settings. CO, a colorless, odorless gas produced during incomplete combustion, binds hemoglobin with an affinity 240 times greater than oxygen, forming COHb and severely impairing oxygen delivery to tissues.[9] Victims of residential fires often die not from burns but from the incapacitating effects of CO, which precede the full development of thermal injuries.[7,10] In this instance, the elevated COHb levels strongly suggest that the couple was neurologically impaired prior to being engulfed by flames.

Modern residential infrastructure, while technologically advanced, often introduces unique risks. Automated door systems, if not equipped with fail-safe manual overrides, can become fatal during emergencies. Similarly, centralized air systems, if not properly ventilated, can accelerate toxic gas accumulation during a fire. Furthermore, the increasing use of synthetic, combustible materials in construction and appliances contributes to high CO gas production when burned.[11]

Preventive Measures and Recommendations

To mitigate future fatalities of this nature, a series of preventive recommendations is proposed:

1. **Mandatory Installation of Manual Override Systems**: All remote-controlled security systems, including automated doors, must incorporate accessible manual overrides to ensure egress during power failures or thermal damage (12).
2. **Adoption of Hybrid Ventilation Systems**: Centralized HVAC systems should be designed to allow for passive or emergency ventilation to prevent gas accumulation in the event of fire.

3. **Enforcement of Fire Safety Compliance**: Routine fire safety audits must be mandated, particularly for homes with integrated electronic infrastructure.
4. **Regular Maintenance of Electrical and AC Units**: Preventive servicing and inspection of HVAC units and electrical systems are critical in identifying and mitigating fire risks.
5. **Use of Fire-Resistant and Low-Toxicity Materials**: Construction and furnishing materials should conform to fire-retardant standards to limit toxic fume production during combustion.

Conclusion

This case reinforces the multifactorial risks associated with modern residential fires, particularly when technological components such as automated security systems and centralized AC units fail. The combination of CO-induced incapacitation, lack of ventilation, and security system malfunction ultimately proved fatal for the victims. A comprehensive approach involving fire-safe architectural design, regular maintenance, public awareness, and policy enforcement is vital to reduce mortality in similar scenarios.

IEC Approval: Approved from IEC
Conflict of Interest: None to declare

References

1. Kamal A, Balachandra T. A review of accidental residential fire death investigations in Alberta 2012–2021. Journal of the Canadian Society of Forensic Science. 2024;1–15.
2. Byard RW. The autopsy evaluation of "straightforward" fire deaths. Forensic Science Medicine and Pathology [Internet]. 2018;14:273 - 5
3. World Health Organization. *A WHO Plan for Burn Prevention and Care*. Geneva: WHO Press; 2008.
4. Weaver LK. Clinical practice: carbon monoxide poisoning. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;360(12):1217–25.
5. Saukko P, Knight B. *Knight's Forensic Pathology*. 4th ed. CRC Press; 2016.
6. Goldstein M. Carbon monoxide poisoning. *J Emerg Nurs*. 2008;34(6):538–42.
7. Kales SN, Soteriades ES, Christophi CA, Christiani DC. Emergency medical service workers: occupational risks of carbon monoxide poisoning. *Am J Med*. 1993;95(1):18–22.
8. Bryan JL. Fire simulation methods in fire scene reconstruction. *J Fire Sci*. 2003;21(2):87–100.
9. Ernst A, Zibrak JD. Carbon monoxide poisoning. *N Engl J Med*. 1998;339(22):1603–8.
10. Purser DA. Toxicity assessment of combustion products. In: Hurley MJ, editor. *SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering*. 5th ed. Springer; 2016.
11. Alarie Y. Toxicity of fire smoke. *Crit Rev Toxicol*. 2002;32(4):259–89.
12. National Fire Protection Association. *NFPA 101: Life Safety Code*. Quincy (MA): NFPA; 2021.