

The complaint

Mrs M has complained about Royal & Sun Alliance Insurance Limited's handling of her claim for a damaged ring under her home insurance policy.

What happened

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties, so I won't repeat them again here. In summary Royal & Sun Alliance (RSA) admitted that there were shortfalls in its handling of the claim Mrs M made in February 2021. It apologised and offered her £500 in compensation. In addition, it has agreed to a quote that she provided for the remount of her ring of £1640.

Our investigator thought that the complaint should be upheld. She recommended that Mrs M was paid an additional £250 in compensation. RSA agreed but Mrs M didn't. The facts are not in dispute so I'll focus on giving the reasons for my 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.

- It's clear that accidentally damaging her engagement ring has been a very traumatic experience for Mrs M and this has been compounded by the actions of RSA and its agents. I've considered the history of the matter, the time taken and the representations made. I've particularly noted the representations of Mrs M, explaining the impact this claim has had. I'm pleased to note that RSA agreed that compensation was due. However I agree with our investigator that the offer was low considering the significant distress and inconvenience caused to Mrs M.
- I'm satisfied that a further £250 is justified, in particular for Mrs M's very negative experience with the initial jewellers, I'll call "B". It is not in dispute that they mis-coded the diamonds, made the mount in the wrong metal and not to the same design, and in the wrong size. RSA's suppliers did make reasonable offers to put things right, but understandably Mrs M had lost all confidence and the relationship with the supplier had by then broken down. Accordingly RSA agreed to honour a quotation from a jeweller of Mrs M's choosing. I find this was fair.
- Mrs M submitted two quotes. I understand that she would like RSA to pay the greater of the two submitted for the repair of her ring - £2000. However I'm satisfied it was reasonable of RSA, and in accordance with usual practice, to agree to the most competitive quote which was £1640.
- I accept that RSA isn't responsible for the delay whilst Mrs M was obtaining quotes. Nevertheless there were delays in authorising the original repairs and the claim overall wasn't handled as speedily as it could have been. Further had the original repair been satisfactory the process could have been concluded more expediently. As it is Mrs M is still without her ring.

- I recognise that Mrs M will be disappointed by my decision as she feels more compensation is due to her. It is difficult to put a figure on the distress that this matter has caused her but considering all the submissions made and the timeline of the matter I find that £750 in total is fair. I understand that £500 has already been credited to Mrs M's account.

My final decision

My final decision is that I uphold this complaint. I require Royal & Sun Alliance Insurance Limited to:

- Pay Mrs M a further £250 in compensation
- Pay Mrs M £1640 (the lower quote for the repair of her ring)

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs M to accept or reject my decision before 11 August 2022.

Lindsey Woloski
Ombudsman