

## **The complaint**

Miss H has complained that American International Group UK Ltd failed to repair or replace her device in a reasonable amount of time, and provided poor customer service.

## **What happened**

Miss H contacted AIG in September 2021 about an issue with her phone as she held a policy with them.

AIG arranged for their repairer to assess and repair the phone. After the repair the phone developed a further fault. Miss H says that the fault was caused by the parts used by the repairer.

She raised a complaint and another tech consultant came to have a look the phone and told her it was unrepairable.

Miss H asked AIG for a replacement, and AIG said they would need to look into it, and eventually issued a replacement in January 2022 but Miss H says their contact was poor.

Miss H complained and AIG partially upheld her complaint in May 2022, acknowledging that there was a delay in her claim being dealt with due to the first repair being faulty and they offered £20 compensation.

Miss H was unhappy with this response and brought her complaint to us. While the complaint has been with our service, AIG offered to replace the phone with no excess fee and have offered additional compensation of £205. I understand the phone has now been replaced.

One of our investigators has looked into Miss H's complaint and thought AIG had made a fair offer.

Miss H disagreed with our investigators view, and so the case has come to me to review.

## **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.

I am upholding this complaint, and I will explain why below.

AIG have accepted that they have delayed in dealing with Miss H's complaint, and they have also agreed that they should have replaced the handset from the outset rather than trying to repair it.

I can see that following the faulty repairs, an exchange of the device was authorised on 24 December 2021 but couldn't be undertaken until 29 January 2022 because Miss H didn't

have the original phone to hand to exchange. So, there was around 3 months of delay caused by AIG and their repairers in getting the replacement authorised.

The new device was then delivered 2022 and Miss H raised a further complaint about this on 12 February 2022 about the camera lens. She was advised by AIG that she needed to raise a separate complaint about the new fault. AIG now accept that as this advice was incorrect as the report was made within 14 days of delivery, and so a swap should have been arranged straight away but wasn't. So, they have offered an additional £205 compensation for this issue as well as the offer to replace the phone with no excess.

A replacement device has now been issued, which I understand was an upgrade as Miss H's device was not in stock.

I can see that this whole situation was frustrating for Miss H and she was without a fully working phone for significant periods of time. However, I do think the offer of £205 additional compensation is fair for the distress and inconvenience suffered, as well as replacing the phone free of excess.

### **Putting things right**

I think that AIG should pay the £205 compensation that they have offered to Miss H.

### **My final decision**

My decision is that I uphold this complaint and direct American International Group UK Ltd to put things right as above.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss H to accept or reject my decision before 25 October 2022.

Joanne Ward  
**Ombudsman**