DRN-5491817

The complaint

Mr S complains that his motor insurance policy provided by Liverpool Victora Insurance Company Limited (LV) isn't showing on the Motor Insurance Database (MID). He wants this corrected.

What happened

DVLA contacted and then fined Mr S because it said his car wasn't showing on MID as insured. Mr S sent it a copy of his policy documents, and the fine was withdrawn. But Mr S was unhappy that neither LV nor the Motor Insurance Bureau (MIB) would take responsibility for the issue. LV said the issue was with MIB and it couldn't assist Mr S. But it paid him £25 compensation for his inconvenience in having to raise the matter several times. Mr S remained unhappy.

Our Investigator recommended that the complaint should be upheld. She thought it was for LV to provide correct information to the MIB so that MID was accurate. LV had shown us that Mr S's record on the main MID was accurate. But his car wasn't showing as insured on the publicly accessible database, askMID.

She thought this was causing Mr S worry and frustration. She thought LV should do more to assist Mr S as it had the relationship with the MIB. She thought it should contact the MIB to ensure that Mr S's records were accurate on all databases and pay him £225 further compensation for his trouble and upset.

LV replied that it didn't agree. It said it had no control over askMID. And so the complaint has come to me for a final 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.

I can understand that Mr S felt frustrated, and worried, that his car wasn't showing on the databases as insured. And he has told us that his car is still showing as uninsured on askMID. So he has had a year of worry and upset at a time when he should be avoiding stress. I was sorry to hear about this.

The Motor Insurance Database (MID) is the central database of motor insurance policy information for all insured vehicles in the UK. The MIB manage this database. We don't consider complaints about the MIB or MID, so I can't consider here the actions of the MIB.

That said, the MIB relies on insurers recording accurate information and has no way of telling if what has been recorded is correct. It won't carry out any verification checks, so it's for the insurer to check all the information recorded is accurate. And the insurer, in this case LV, has an obligation to provide accurate information to the MIB.

LV said Mr S's car was showing as insured on the main MID, but not on the database that the public can access to check their own cars, askMID. LV provided us with a screenshot showing that the car was showing as insured on the main MID.

But this doesn't explain why the DVLA, which relies on the main MID, should have contacted Mr S saying that his car wasn't insured. So I assume that there must have been some error in the communication of Mr S's car's details between LV and MIB. And this must have been corrected on the main MID, but not askMID.

Mr S raised this matter with LV and the MIB and neither would accept responsibility for it. They referred Mr S back to the other. The MIB said it relied on insurers providing accurate information. But LV said it had no control over askMID and it couldn't correct it.

But I'm satisfied that LV is responsible for ensuring that Mr S's policy details are correctly recorded on all the MIB's databases. LV has the relationship with the MIB, not Mr S. And the MIB made it clear to Mr S that he should contact his insurer to resolve the issue. But LV, despite knowing this, referred Mr S back to askMID, causing him frustration.

I think LV should have done more to help Mr S resolve the matter by contacting the MIB directly rather than telling him that it couldn't do anything and that he should contact the MIB himself. And so I don't think LV has treated Mr S fairly and reasonably.

When a business makes a mistake, as I think LV has done here, we expect it to restore the consumer's position, as far as it's able to do so. And we also consider the impact the error had on the consumer.

I can see that Mr S's policy with LV is due to expire imminently. So it may be too late to remedy the incorrect information showing on askMID. But I think LV should still make an effort to do this to give Mr S some reassurance.

LV paid Mr S £25 compensation for the trouble he was caused in having to raise this matter with it repeatedly. But I'm not satisfied that this goes far enough in the circumstances. I think Mr S has been left unsupported to sort this matter out when it was for LV to do more. He was threatened with a fine by the DVLA. He has been caused worry that his car may be towed away. He has had to repeatedly contact LV and the MIB to try and resolve the issue, without success, taking his time and effort.

Our Investigator recommended that LV should pay Mr S £225 further compensation for this trouble and upset. I think that's fair and reasonable as it's in keeping with our published guidance for where an issue has caused avoidable stress and inconvenience over a long period.

Putting things right

I require Liverpool Victora Insurance Company Limited to do the following:

1. Urgently contact the MIB to resolve the issue so that Mr S's car shows as insured on askMID.
2. Pay Mr S £225 further compensation for the distress and inconvenience caused by its level of service.

My final decision

For the reasons given above, my final decision is that I uphold this complaint. I require Liverpool Victora Insurance Company Limited to carry out the redress set out above.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr S to accept or reject my decision before 31 July 2025.

Phillip Berechree
Ombudsman