

The complaint

Mr Q has complained about how Admiral Insurance (Gibraltar) Limited ('Admiral') had dealt with a claim under a home insurance policy.

References to Admiral include companies acting on its behalf.

What happened

Mr Q made a claim for an escape of water at his home. Mr Q chased progress on the claim and then made a complaint.

When Admiral replied to the complaint, it accepted communication had been poor. It also accepted that there had been some delays in progressing the claim. It offered a total of £230 compensation for the impact on Mr Q.

When Mr Q complained to this service, our investigator upheld the complaint. She said Admiral should pay Mr Q a further £200 compensation because of the disruption to Mr Q.

As Mr Q didn't agree this sufficiently addressed his concerns, the complaint was referred to me.

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.

Having done so, I uphold this complaint. I will explain why.

My decision only deals with the period up to 23 February 2023, which is the date of the final response Admiral issued on the complaint.

Mr Q complained about the lack of progress on the claim and issues with contacting the company dealing with the claim for Admiral. I can see this has been a lengthy claim and that Mr Q is concerned that it is still ongoing. However, I will focus on the period covered by this complaint.

Admiral accepted there had been poor communication and some delays in progressing the claim. By the time it responded to the complaint, the claim had been ongoing for about five months. All claims are likely to result in some level of disruption to a policyholder, but I think what happened in this instance was more than I would normally expect. I can understand Mr Q's frustration and concern and I'm also aware there were other significant events taking place in Mr Q's life around this time.

Mr Q was paid a disturbance allowance because of the disruption to his cooking facilities, so I think this addressed some of the disruption. Admiral also accepted there were issues with the claim handling. It offered £230 compensation for this. Looking at what happened and the amount of compensation I would normally say a business should pay in these

circumstances, I don't think this was enough to recognise the issues raised, the timeframe involved and the impact on Mr Q. As a result, I think Admiral should pay a further £200 compensation, so that it pays a total of £430 compensation.

I'm aware Mr Q has said he doesn't think this is enough compensation. However, looking at the period the complaint covered, I think this is a fair amount for Admiral to pay. I'm also aware Mr Q is concerned that his claim is still ongoing and that he doesn't think this is sufficient to incentivise Admiral to address the inaction on his claim. The purpose of compensation isn't to punish a business. If Mr Q has ongoing concerns with his claim, including whether he should still be paid disturbance allowance, he needs to raise this with Admiral directly.

Putting things right

Admiral should pay Mr Q an additional £200 compensation, which is £430 in total.

My final decision

For the reasons I have given, it is my final decision that this complaint is upheld. I require Admiral Insurance (Gibraltar) Limited to pay Mr Q an additional £200 compensation, which is £430 in total.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr Q to accept or reject my decision before 24 August 2023.

Louise O'Sullivan
Ombudsman