

## **The complaint**

Mr C complains about incorrect quotes he believed he received from RCI Financial Services Limited trading as Mobilize Financial Services ("RCI") when he enquired about purchasing a battery from them.

## **What happened**

In July 2020, Mr C acquired a battery which was installed in a used car, when he took out a hire agreement with RCI. The minimum term of the agreement was 36 months and Mr C was to pay regular monthly rentals of £48.98. The insured value of the battery recorded on the agreement was £6,160. The agreement also said that the insured value would reduce by 10% each calendar year on a pro-rata monthly basis.

When the agreement was nearing the end of its term, Mr C enquired about transferring ownership of the battery to himself. Mr C was given a quote of around £1,100 to purchase it.

In February 2024, Mr C asked RCI for an update to the cost of the battery if he was to purchase it. RCI responded and provided a cost of around £890. They also explained that the battery couldn't be sold directly to Mr C, and for invoicing purposes it needed to be purchased through a third-party.

Mr C asked for another updated quote in December 2024. He was given a quote of minus £2,053.20 but was asked to pay £2,053.20 if he wished to purchase the battery. Mr C didn't understand why he had to pay this amount when the quote generated was a negative figure and he believed its value should have been zero.

RCI explained to Mr C that it was because the price of the battery could increase or decrease, and any prices given were only valid for 14 days.

Mr C complained to RCI in January 2025. Among other things, Mr C believed he was given inconsistent and incorrect information in relation to the cost of the battery. Mr C didn't agree with the quotes given and believed it contradicted how things were set out in the agreement. Mr C believed the battery's purchase price in December 2024 should have been zero pounds.

RCI provided Mr C their final response. They explained the insured value of the battery does reduce by 10% each year, but as the battery was still in working order, it would still hold a value. RCI also gave further information to Mr C about his options and provided updated costs that were involved for each option. For example, they explained that the battery purchase price at the time, which was valid for 14 days, was £541.20. RCI also gave an updated figure in relation to the costs to return the battery.

Unhappy with RCI's final response, Mr C referred his complaint to our service. Mr C was unhappy as he continued to be charged monthly rentals for the battery after December 2024 and as the agreement hadn't been terminated, he was unable to sell the car where the battery was installed.

Our investigator issued their view and explained that she didn't uphold Mr C's complaint. In summary, the investigator didn't think RCI acted unfairly in the quotes they gave Mr C in relation to the battery value. The investigator also thought the terms were set out clearly and fair in relation to returning the battery and in relation to having diagnostics carried out to the battery to determine its charging capacity.

Mr C disagreed with the investigator's findings. Among other things, Mr C didn't think the investigator had calculated the value of the battery correctly and hadn't applied the terms of the agreement correctly.

As Mr C disagreed with the investigator's view, the complaint was passed to me to decide.

### **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'm not upholding this complaint and I'll explain why below.

If there's something I've not mentioned, it isn't because I've ignored it. I haven't. I'm satisfied I don't need to comment on every individual point or argument to be able to reach what I think is a fair outcome. Our rules allow me to do this. This simply reflects the informal nature of our service as an alternative to the courts.

Mr C complains about quotes he was given in relation to a battery he acquired when he took out a hire agreement. Entering into consumer credit contracts such as this is a regulated activity, so I'm satisfied I can consider Mr C's complaint about RCI.

Mr C believes the value of the battery should reduce by 10% each year. Mr C has relied on a formula provided within the agreement and terms set out within it in making this complaint point. Mr C has also provided some brief calculations on what he believes the value of the battery to be at certain points throughout the agreement, alongside his reasoning to why he thinks its value should have been zero pounds in December 2024. Mr C believes the investigator and RCI have not correctly applied the terms of the agreement.

While I appreciate Mr C's comments here, I don't think I need to make a finding on this matter. I say this because Mr C's complaint is in relation to requesting a battery *purchase* price from RCI and that he believes he was given an inaccurate quote. The battery *purchase* price is different from the *insured value*. There is nothing in the terms to suggest that the insured value of a battery and how that is calculated over the years an agreement progresses is the same as how a battery purchase price is to be calculated.

RCI has explained that the value of the battery will differ and is dependent on market value. And I'm satisfied with RCI's comments here as it seems reasonable it would be calculated, based on market value, the age of the battery and type of battery.

It's also worth highlighting that the agreement Mr C took out with RCI was a hire agreement. So, there is no option for Mr C to purchase the battery under the terms of the agreement – nor is there any obligation on RCI to sell the battery to Mr C. This explains why the agreement is silent in relation to the battery purchase price or how that price is calculated over the years. And a FAQ document which Mr C would have seen when he acquired the battery also explains that once a car has been registered including a battery lease, then it is not possible for the first or subsequent owner of the car to own the battery. So, while I appreciate Mr C's comments that he thinks RCI gave inconsistent and unhelpful quotes, I

don't think they did anything wrong in not sharing to Mr C how they calculate it in the first place.

I have also noted that the information Mr C was supplied in both the hire agreement and in FAQ documents in relation to the battery hire were clear in next steps if Mr C chose to sell the car which the battery was attached to. So I'm not satisfied that RCI has done anything wrong when they explained to Mr C the next steps in relation to having a diagnostic check completed on the battery to determine its charging capacity, and in relation to returning the battery if he chose to do so.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons I've explained, I don't uphold this complaint. So, I don't require RCI Financial Services Limited trading as Mobilize Financial Services to do anything more here.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr C to accept or reject my decision before 5 November 2025.

Ronesh Amin  
**Ombudsman**