

The complaint

Mr S has complained on behalf of E, a limited company, about the service it received from British Gas Services Limited trading as British Gas (BG) under a home emergency policy.

What happened

E had home emergency cover with BG which included an annual boiler service and gas safety check for several properties which are let to tenants. An appointment was booked for a service and check at one of the properties. It was due to take place on 17 February 2025.

The engineer noted the visit as unsuccessful. He put a card through the letter box as he thought no-one was at home. Mr S said the engineer should have phoned ahead of his visit and hadn't rung the doorbell at the property although the tenants were at home.

Mr S complained to BG. It said it doesn't guarantee that its engineers will call ahead of their arrival at a property and it isn't contractually obliged to do this. The appointment was rescheduled for ten days later. BG offered Mr S £50 as a goodwill gesture. He said he'd accept £100. BG agreed to that.

Mr S was also unhappy with the way BG had handled the complaint. In particular, it hadn't acknowledged his complaint within three working days.

Mr S referred a complaint on behalf of E to our service. Our Investigator said we couldn't look at the way BG had handled the complaint as it was outside our jurisdiction. He didn't recommend the complaint be upheld. He thought BG had done enough to put right its customer service mistakes.

Mr S didn't agree. He thought the compensation should be increased to £200. He also said BG's poor service and complaint handling had adversely affected his health.

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.

As our Investigator explained, complaint handling isn't a regulated activity. That means I'm not able to consider how BG handled E's complaint.

It's not in dispute that the service provided by BG wasn't as good as it should have been. Although its engineers aren't obliged to phone ahead of appointments, they should at least ring the doorbell on arrival at a property even if they think no-one is at home as appearances can be misleading. Missed appointments are very frustrating for tenants and landlords alike. I need to decide whether the amount of compensation offered by BG to E for its shortcomings was fair and reasonable. I'm sorry to disappoint Mr S but I think it was.

It's important to bear in mind that Mr S is not the complainant in this case – E is. As E is a limited company, it can't be distressed but it can be inconvenienced. I'm sorry to hear about Mr S's serious health problems which I have taken into account as I think this increased the

level of inconvenience to E. However, overall I agree that £100 is fair in the circumstances of this complaint to reflect the inconvenience caused to E by the way BG carried out the service and its having to rearrange it. It's in line with what I would have awarded if no such offer had been made. So I won't be requiring BG to do anything further.

My final decision

For the reasons explained above, I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask E to accept or reject my decision before 2 December 2025.

Elizabeth Grant
Ombudsman