

The complaint

Mr A complains about the amount U K Insurance Limited (“UKI”) said it would pay for a claim made on his home contents insurance policy.

What happened

In March 2025 Mr A’s car was broken into. A considerable amount of personal possessions were stolen from it. He contacted UKI and made a claim.

Under the terms of his policy, Mr A had £7,000 of unspecified personal possessions cover. He estimated his loss at £8,000 in total, which included a laptop with some important research materials on which was crucial for his work.

UKI assessed the claim and said it would pay £1,000, as that was the limit under Mr A’s policy.

He complained that the settlement amount was far less than the value of his possessions.

UKI said it thought the limit was clearly stated in the policy wording and didn’t uphold his complaint.

As Mr A remained unhappy, he brought his complaint to this service.

Our investigator said he thought the policy terms and conditions made it clear what the limit applying to Mr A’s claim was, so he didn’t think the complaint would be upheld.

Mr A didn’t agree with the view. He said the policy limit wasn’t included in the IPID, and he said key exclusions should be brought to his attention. He said that UKI’s claims handlers tried to coerce him into accepting the lower claim limit. He asks that UKI pays his claim.

Because Mr A didn’t agree, his complaint has been passed to me to make a 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.

Having done so, while I understand Mr A will be disappointed, I’m not going to uphold his complaint as I think the limit was set out in the policy wording and UKI has fairly applied it.

I do appreciate the points Mr A’s made, and I hope he’s been able to recover the work he had recorded on his laptop.

I’ll start by saying that Mr A has raised several points in his approach to this service, and made more in his most recent responses to the view in which he’s talked about UKI’s regulatory breaches. I need to point out that this is an independent dispute resolution service. We’re not the regulator, which is the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA). What I’m able to do is look at UKI’s actions and decide if it acted fairly and reasonably, and in line with

its policy wording when it applied the limit to Mr A's claim settlement amount.

I'm also need to say I'm not going to respond to all of the points made by Mr A, which is in line with the informal approach of this service.

I've looked at Mr A's policy documents which show he had cover for £7,000 of unspecified personal possessions away from the home.

Under the terms of the policy, his claim would have fallen under the personal possessions section of cover as the items he was claiming for were outside his home. The items were inside his motor vehicle, which was unattended.

The policy booklet itself contains limits for the cover. This says, on page four:

"Summary of policy limits

The following is a summary of the main policy limits. You should read the rest of this policy for the full terms and conditions."

Personal Possessions

Theft from unattended motor vehicle £1,000"

The policy wording includes a section on personal possessions:

"How much we will pay

The most we will pay for any claim will be:

£1,000 for theft from an unattended motor vehicle."

I think both of these parts of the policy wording are clear.

Mr A says the above exclusion wasn't specifically drawn to his attention and isn't included in the policy schedule or the Insurance Product Information Document ("IPID").

UKI needs to highlight any terms which are unusual or significant. The FCA provides guidance which says that in determining what exclusions or limitation are significant, a firm should in particular consider terms which may have an adverse effect on the benefit payable under a policy. Then it is up to Mr A to decide whether the policy meets his needs or not.

Taking everything into account, I think the £1,000 claim limit from a motor vehicle was reasonably brought to Mr A's attention twice in the policy documents. I don't think a limit restricting the amount of cover given for theft from an unattended motor vehicle is unusual, and I think it's been fairly applied.

I can see Mr A has said he would have bought a policy elsewhere if he'd have known about the particular limit. In other words, it's a significant limitation for him. But I'd say that if this part of cover was the most important to him, then I think it's fair I say he should have contacted UKI and asked it questions to clarify whether a limit applied, or checked his own policy documents for clarification.

Mr A has also complained about coercive comments made by UKI's staff as he said it appeared they were trying to persuade him to accept the lower claim limit. I've listened to the calls I've been provided and I don't agree with his assertions. I think UKI's claims staff were telling him about the limit on cover under his policy, and that was the maximum amount

they'd be able to pay.

I would say I can hear there's some confusion on one of the calls where UKI's staff member seems to be looking at the policy booklet, when Mr A is asking questions about what he can see on the policy schedule, and I can understand why Mr A was concerned by this apparent discrepancy between what he's been told it says, and what he's looking at. But this doesn't change my decision as the policy booklet and schedule are to be read together.

In his later responses to this service, he's made various points about lack of clarity in the structure of the wording, including that the casual reader might misunderstand the difference to, or inclusion of, for example, pedal cycles in the personal possessions section of cover. But I don't agree. I think the meaning is clear, and as I mention above, if Mr A has questions specifically about this, I think he had the opportunity to ask UKI as he'd had the policy for several months.

I do sympathise with Mr A as he's clearly lost a significant amount of possessions in the theft, but I don't think UKI has acted unfairly and I think it's reasonably applied the limit to Mr A's claim.

My final decision

It's my final decision that I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr A to accept or reject my decision before 18 November 2025.

Richard Sowden
Ombudsman