

## **The complaint**

Miss P complains about the communication received from Liverpool Victoria Insurance Company Limited trading as LV= when confirming the price of her car insurance policy. She was sent a letter showing the premium as being lower than the price she had already paid and complains that she was overcharged and is entitled to a refund. Throughout the complaint Miss P has been represented by her partner but for clarity I will refer to Miss P throughout.

## **What happened**

Miss P agreed cover for her car over the telephone at a price of £325.68. When she later received written confirmation of her cover, along with details of the policies for her partner's car and their home, the letter showed her own car's premium as being only £287.42. She complained to LV that she had been given different information and that she should receive a refund on the difference between the two prices.

LV explained that its letter confirmed the price of all three policies for the year but that they had differing start dates. It said that the individual prices shown were for the premiums for the whole year for each policy but that they included any discounts which would apply had the policies all been taken out at the same time. LV explained that the total amount shown as payable for the three policies for the current year was correct and included the £325.68 which had been quoted for Miss P's car. LV said that the information supplied in the letter was correct and that she had been quoted and paid the right price for her car's policy.

Miss P was unhappy with the explanation and complained to this service. Our investigator considered Miss P's arguments and the explanation received from LV and decided that the complaint should not be upheld. She felt that LV had shown that the correct premium had been paid and that the different information shown on the letter had been properly explained,

Miss P was unhappy with that view and the explanation and has asked for the complaint to be considered by an ombudsman. She feels that the explanation is confusing and believes that she may have been overcharged and should receive a refund.

## **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.

My decision is that I do not uphold this complaint and I will explain why.

Miss P hasn't challenged that she had agreed to pay the higher amount when originally discussing the premium for her car. I understand that she and her partner were also in the process of agreeing cover for his car and their house, to start at different points later in the year. What is in dispute is how LV communicated the costs later on and whether they have

made a mistake at some point which means that the premium she was quoted was wrong. I'm satisfied that was not the case.

Miss P is unhappy at how LV and our investigator have explained the letter and I have some sympathy with her position. I think that the letter she was sent which showed the three policies' costs isn't totally clear. LV have explained, the letter does have a note that says that there may be premium price differences between what is shown and what is actually charged based on the differing start dates for policies. But it has also explained that the premiums it has included are those that would have applied had all of the policies been taken out at the same time. It says that this is for illustrative purposes, including what the full multi policy discount would be for a whole year. That would have resulted in Miss P's car premiums being lower at £287.42, rather than the higher price that she had paid.

The notes below the prices go on to say that "this is to give you an indication of how much the cover would be for a full year based on the information you've given us". I can see how LV means this to be interpreted but it doesn't explicitly state that it includes different values for the multi policy discount. It's understandable that Mrs P didn't realise this and was concerned as a result.

But having agreed that this could be more clearly explained I don't believe that the complaint should be upheld. That's because LV have explained this meaning to Miss P already, when she first got in touch, and because I don't believe that LV have made a mistake with her premium. The letter shows the total costs payable for the year's cover for the three policies which is the correct amount and includes the full cost that Miss P is paying for her car, and which she previously agreed to. It is also correct that this doesn't qualify for the full year's impact of the multi policy discount offered by LV. As a result there is no refund due or appropriate. LV's letter could be clearer in its explanation of each policy's price but it has explained what is meant by the different figures and confirmed that those figures are correct in all regards.

### **My final decision**

I do not uphold this complaint against Liverpool Victoria Insurance Company Limited trading as LV=.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss P to accept or reject my decision before 24 March 2025.

John Withington  
**Ombudsman**