

## **The complaint**

Mr T complains about how Royal and Sun Alliance Insurance Limited trading as More Than (RSA) dealt with the renewal and subsequent cancellation of his motor insurance.

## **What happened**

Mr T had motor insurance with RSA. About four weeks before the renewal date, RSA wrote to him to invite him to renew the policy. RSA wrote again two weeks later as Mr T hadn't yet renewed. On the morning of the renewal date, RSA cancelled the policy as it hadn't heard from Mr T or received payment for the policy renewal. Later the same day, Mr T's payment was matched to his account by RSA's finance team. Mr T had made the payment by bank transfer a few days earlier.

RSA contacted Mr T and explained the policy had been cancelled. RSA offered to reinstate the cover, but Mr T decided to cancel the policy and asked for a refund.

Shortly after this, Mr T complained to RSA about the cancellation and that he hadn't received the refund. Later he also complained that the refund had been made to his credit card, although he had asked RSA not to retain the credit card details.

RSA failed to log Mr T's letter as a complaint. As Mr T hadn't had a response to his complaint, he complained to this service. When we contacted RSA, it said it hadn't had a complaint from Mr T and it asked for the usual eight weeks we would give it to respond. However RSA still didn't respond to Mr T in the time allowed, so his complaint was allocated to one of our investigators.

Before our investigator had sent their view about the complaint to Mr T and RSA, RSA sent its final response letter to Mr T. RSA upheld Mr T's complaint, apologised and said it was sending him a cheque for £275 for the upset and inconvenience caused.

Our investigator upheld Mr T's complaint, but said RSA's offer was reasonable and fairly addressed the impact of its errors.

Mr T wasn't happy with what the investigator said, so his complaint has been passed to me. Mr T wants additional compensation to cover the extra cost of the new motor insurance policy he took out and the costs of the tracked postage for his letters of complaint.

## **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 uphold Mr T's complaint but I think what RSA has already offered to do to resolve it is fair and reasonable.

Mr T has told this service that the compensation RSA awarded him was satisfactory as far as its wrongdoings were concerned, so I'm not going to go into any detail about these.

However Mr T says this compensation didn't cover the extra expenses he incurred.

RSA offered to reinstate Mr T's insurance policy, but he chose to cancel it and take out an alternative policy elsewhere. He says this was more expensive and he wants RSA to pay the difference. However because Mr T could have kept the original policy with RSA at no extra cost, I don't think it would be fair or reasonable to expect RSA to compensate him for the extra cost of the new policy.

Mr T also wants RSA to compensate him for the cost of the tracked postage to send his complaint letters. This service doesn't expect businesses to cover the usual reasonable costs of making a complaint, so I'm not asking RSA to compensate Mr T for this.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons given above, I uphold Mr T's complaint. But I think what Royal and Sun Alliance Insurance Limited trading as More Than has already offered to do is fair and reasonable. If Royal and Sun Alliance Insurance Limited trading as More Than has already paid the £275 compensation to Mr T, I'm not asking it to do anything more. If Royal and Sun Alliance Insurance Limited trading as More Than hasn't yet paid the £275 compensation to Mr T, I require it to do so now.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr T to accept or reject my decision before 18 May 2023.

Sarah Baalham  
**Ombudsman**