

The complaint

Mrs F complains about the increase in her premium after she declared a non-fault claim for a named driver when she applied for a car insurance policy with Covea Insurance plc.

Reference to Covea includes its agents. Mrs F was represented when she referred her complaint to this Service, but I'll refer to Mrs F throughout because she is the complainant.

What happened

Mrs F requested a Covea car insurance quote via a price comparison website - she added her husband as a named driver and included details of his non-fault claim.

Mrs F complained to Covea that declaring the non-fault claim for her husband caused an increase in the premium and may continue to impact her premiums in the future. She said Covea hadn't justified the increase, and she didn't think the increased premium had been applied fairly.

In its final response letter Covea acknowledged Mrs F's disappointment but said a number of factors were considered when calculating the premium including non-fault claims of all drivers on the policy. So it didn't uphold Mrs F's complaint.

Our Investigator didn't uphold the complaint. She said she had seen examples from Covea about how non-fault claims could have an impact on the premium charged. So, she was satisfied the policy was priced fairly.

As Mrs F didn't agree with our Investigator, the complaint has been passed to me to decide. Mrs F raised a number of concerns including that Covea's pricing information couldn't be shared. She believes it should be under the principles of natural justice. She also raised issue with general comments made in the investigation about common industry practice and thinks there should be an industry wide review on how insurers price their policies.

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've decided to not uphold it and I'll now explain why.

As this is an informal service, I'm not going to respond here to every point or comment on every piece of evidence Mrs F and Covea has provided. Instead, I've focused on those I consider to be key, or central to the issue in dispute.

Mrs F has raised a number of concerns about the pricing of the policy Covea offered, but the key issue here is whether it has evidenced fair pricing of the policy in line with its underwriting criteria. I'll focus on this key point in my decision.

It's not my role, nor anyone's at this Service to tell an insurer what risk factors should be considered when pricing an insurance policy. Nor is it my role to say what weighting should be placed on those factors. An insurer's approach and attitude to risk is for it to decide and forms part of its commercial decision.

What I can determine is whether or not Covea priced Mrs F's policy fairly, based on its own underwriting criteria. I'm satisfied it has fairly applied its underwriting criteria. Covea sent details of the ratings and loadings that led to an increase in Mrs F's premium. This information is commercially sensitive so I can't share it. But I've seen it, and I'm satisfied it took into account the correct information, and that the price generated is based on this criteria.

I understand Mrs F's disappointment because she says her husband's claim was recorded as non-fault, so she believes the premium shouldn't be affected. But Covea's underwriting shows it rates on all claims and incidents even if the driver isn't to blame. This isn't an unusual approach, and many insurers do the same. As stated above, I'm satisfied Covea has calculated this premium fairly, in line with its criteria. This means I'm satisfied anyone else in the same situation would be treated the same.

Mrs F believes Covea's underwriting information should form part of the information that we can share due to natural justice. But as stated above, our Service considers this information to be commercially sensitive which means this isn't something we can share.

Mrs F also says she believes the pricing of policy's should have an industry wide review. This isn't something that would fall under my remit to decide. My role is to consider Mrs F's complaint and the evidence provided by both parties to reach a fair outcome. Any industry wide reviews would fall under the responsibility of the regulator, The Financial Conduct Authority.

Overall, I'm satisfied Mrs F's policy has been priced using the correct information and that information has been assessed fairly against Covea's pricing criteria.

My final decision

For the reasons set out above, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs F to accept or reject my decision before 27 December 2025.

Colleen Cousins
Ombudsman