

The complaint

Mr M complains he was misled by Quote Detective into entering a more expensive policy than he had found elsewhere.

What happened

On 21 May 2025 Mr M contacted Quote Detective to obtain a quote for van insurance. The agent he spoke to, after quoting a price of £1,754.56, told Mr M this was the cheapest price he would find. Mr M accepted the quotation and proceeded with the policy due to start on 26 May 2025.

On 25 May, Mr M said he compared quotes online and found a policy elsewhere that was £500 cheaper than the one offered by Quote Detective. Feeling misled by what the agent had told him, Mr M raised his concerns with Quote Detective. It reviewed the call recording from when the policy was sold and told Mr M their agent had not told him their quote was the cheapest he would find.

Mr M, confident this is what he was told, asked for a further review. Quote Detective then accepted its agent had made this claim and, to put things right, it offered Mr M a full refund of all he had paid including the premium, the arrangement fee and the additional premium for breakdown cover. Mr M did not accept this offer and so the policy remained active.

Mr M complained to Quote Detective who responded upholding the complaint. It said it was unacceptable for its agent to have made the claim and offered £50 compensation; pointing out Mr M had chosen not to receive the full refund offered and, instead, chose to continue with the policy.

Mr M remained unhappy so referred his complaint to our service. One of our investigators looked into it, and they recommended it was upheld but that the compensation offer of £50 from Quote Detective wasn't increased. In summary, they said Mr M had the opportunity to mitigate his losses before the policy started by invoking his right to cancel the policy at the time he found a cheaper policy online – and could have later complained about the £75 cancellation fee this would have triggered. The investigator acknowledged Quote Detective had also, after the policy was in force, given Mr M the option to cancel and receive a full refund. They felt that given Mr M chose to continue with the policy, the £50 compensation offered was a fair reflection of any distress and inconvenience suffered.

Mr M disagreed. He says cancelling his policy was not a realistic option as any replacement policy starting the next day would have been significantly more expensive and he was dealing with a heavy workload and a partner's health condition at the time. Mr M also says he was misled twice by Quote Detective, once during the initial call and again after he raised his concerns. He doesn't feel the £50 is a fair amount of compensation to reflect this or the time he spent trying to resolve the matter.

He asked for a decision, so his complaint has now been passed to me for 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, I have decided to uphold this complaint. I'll explain why.

The Insurance: Conduct of Business Sourcebook (ICOBS) explains:

2.2.2R When a firm communicates information, including a financial promotion, to a customer it must ensure that is clear, fair and not misleading.

Quote Detective has accepted its agent provided misleading information on its initial call with Mr M by telling him the quote was the cheapest price he would find on the market.

So, the only matter for me to decide is whether its apology and offer of £50 compensation it ultimately offered to Mr M is appropriate to put things right. Having considered everything, I'm satisfied it is.

I say this because Mr M had two opportunities to mitigate any loss suffered by his reliance on the incorrect statement made by Quote Detective's agent. Mr M first had the opportunity to do this when he discovered a cheaper quote. Taking into account the £75 cancellation fee Mr M would have had to pay Quote Detective but the policy he had found elsewhere was £500 cheaper, I would've reasonably expected him to mitigate his loss by cancelling the policy. And the cancellation fee is something he could've later complained about.

Quote Detective also gave Mr M the opportunity to mitigate his losses a second time by offering him a full refund of all he had paid including the premium, the arrangement fee and the additional premium for breakdown cover.

Mr M chose not to mitigate his loss on either occasion and to continue with the quote he says was more expensive. Whilst I recognise he has recently told this service he couldn't accept the cheaper quote because cancelling his policy was not a realistic option as any replacement policy starting the next day would have been significantly more expensive; he told Quote Detective at the time that the cheaper quote he had obtained was for the policy to start the next day.

Mr M has also said that he later offered to provide Quote Detective with the insurer's reference number for this cheaper quote so I'm satisfied he could have contacted this insurer and accepted the quote should he have wished to do so. I'm sorry to hear that someone close to Mr M was unwell at the time and I acknowledge he's said he was busy with his own businesses workload; but as he had found the quote online and taken the time to contact Quote Detective about it I'm satisfied that Mr M had the opportunity here to mitigate his own losses before the policy arranged through Quote Detective began.

Having decided not to take either opportunity to mitigate his losses, I don't consider any further award would be fair and reasonable beyond what has already been offered to recognise any distress and inconvenience faced by Mr M as a result of the incorrect statement. Quote Detective hasn't explained why initially, after Mr M raised his concerns, it denied their agent had made the claim. And, whilst I can appreciate this would have been frustrating for Mr M, I don't find this in itself had a material impact on him. I say this because this denial did not ultimately change the position Mr M was in with regards to mitigating his own losses.

Taking everything into account, I'm satisfied Quote Detectives offer of £50 compensation,

and an apology is a fair and reasonable way to resolve the complaint.

My final decision

For the reasons above, I have decided to uphold this complaint.

Quote Detective has already made an offer to pay £50 to settle the complaint and I think this offer is fair in all the circumstances.

So, my decision is that Quote Detective should pay £50 to Mr M into a bank account of his choosing.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr M to accept or reject my decision before 12 February 2026.

Mark Louth
Ombudsman