

## The complaint

Mr S complains that Coverwise Ltd mis-sold him a travel insurance policy.

## What happened

Mr S took out a travel insurance policy through Coverwise, an insurance broker. The policy was underwritten by an insurance company, which I'll refer to as A. This complaint focuses solely on Coverwise's actions. There's a separate complaint about A's actions.

While he was on holiday, Mr S's camcorder was stolen so he made a claim on his policy. Mr S says A settled the claim for less than it should have but A explained there was a single item limit of £200 and so it had settled the claim fairly.

Mr S didn't agree and complained to Coverwise, saying it had mis-sold him the policy as it didn't cover him for what he needed. He said he was told single items would be covered for a *minimum* of £200 and was told specifically his camcorder would be covered on a new for old basis.

Unhappy with Coverwise's response he brought the complaint to us. Our investigator concluded that the policy hadn't been mis-sold and that the single item limit of £200 had been made clear to Mr S.

Mr S asked an ombudsman to make a decision.

## What I've decided – and why

I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

And having done so, I've reached the same conclusion as the investigator and for the same reasons. I'll explain why.

The FCA's Insurance Conduct of Business Sourcebook explains the responsibilities placed on insurance brokers when dealing with consumers. It requires them to provide information which is clear, fair and not misleading. So I'll be considering Mr S's complaint with that in mind together with what I consider to be fair and reasonable.

The first thing I considered was the call during which Mr S bought the policy from Coverwise. I've listened very carefully to this call.

Mr S says he was told the single item limit was a *minimum* of £200 and that his camcorder would be covered on a new for old basis. I heard neither of these things during the call.

The agent laid out clearly the key elements of cover under the policy, including the £200 single item limit. Mr S queried this as he wasn't sure if the agent had said the limit was £250

or £200. The agent repeated that the limit was £200 and Mr S acknowledged this. There was no reference to the camcorder specifically or to cover on a new for old basis.

So I'm satisfied the agent explained the key elements of cover clearly during the call.

I've then gone on to consider the documentation that was sent to Mr S after the purchase of the policy. I've looked at this carefully and under the section "Significant features and benefits", Section D states the single item limit is £200 with a £50 excess.

So, I'm satisfied the documentation makes it clear the single item limit is £200.

It also explains Mr S can cancel the policy without charge within 14 days of taking it out. He could have taken advantage of this if he'd been unhappy with the terms of the policy after he received the full details.

In summary, I'm satisfied Coverwise has provided Mr S with information that was clear, fair and not misleading. So I won't be upholding the complaint or asking Coverwise to do any more.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr S to accept or reject my decision before 26 December 2019.

Paul Phillips  
**Ombudsman**