

The complaint

Mr B complains about Admiral Insurance (Gibraltar) Limited's handling of his telematics motor insurance policy.

What happened

The circumstances of this complaint are well known to both parties, but in summary, Mr B arranged a telematics motor insurance policy, underwritten by Admiral, in March 2025. Following the normal use of his vehicle, Mr B said the telematics box had rated his driving score as poor – which he found surprising as his previous telematic box policy with another insurer didn't score his driving the same way. Mr B adjusted his driving in the hope this would improve his score, but it didn't present any change.

Concerned Admiral would cancel his policy due to the score, Mr B asked to cancel the policy, but Admiral informed him there would be cancellation charges of £160. Unhappy with this, Mr B complained to Admiral about the way it handled his telematics policy, and the cancellation fees.

Admiral didn't uphold the complaint as it was satisfied it had acted in line with the terms and conditions of the policy, and Mr B was given sufficient information to understand the applicable fees when the policy was sold to him.

Unhappy with the response, Mr B referred his complaint to this Service. Our Investigator ultimately didn't uphold the complaint as they were satisfied Admiral had acted fairly, and in line with the terms of the policy.

Mr B disagreed. In summary he said he felt it was more likely there was a fault with the telematics box, and that due to the score of his driving, he had no choice but to cancel the policy before Admiral did.

So, the case has been 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.

I recognise that my summary of Mr B's complaint is less detailed than presented. But I'd like to assure both parties that I have carefully considered all submissions made in support of the complaint. My decision may not comment on each point raised or piece of evidence provided but will instead comment on the issues I consider to be key. This isn't intended as a discourtesy but reflects the informal nature of this Service – and the rules this Service is expected to adhere to enable me to do this.

Having reviewed all available evidence, I don't uphold this complaint. I'll explain why.

I understand why Mr B was concerned about his driving score and the risk of his policy being cancelled. So, I've looked carefully at the evidence from both sides and the policy terms to

decide what's fair and reasonable.

Mr B has said that the data recorded by the telematics box wasn't accurate. So, the starting point here is the policy terms and conditions which sets out how the policy works, and what data is recorded under the policy. The policy explains that the telematics box measures how and when a policyholder drives – things like smoothness, speed, and time of day. Admiral uses this information to build a score. This score can affect future renewals or, if it drops significantly, lead to cancellation.

Admiral has provided this Service with copies of the data recorded by the telematics box, which Mr B has also had sight of. Mr B's concerns with the data are, in summary, that he is being penalised for journeys that start prior to, but then end during the night driving period, and the scores showed no improvement despite his efforts to change his driving habits.

However, Admiral has explained that the scoring is completed on a cumulative basis – meaning the data is looked at as a whole, rather than as individual instances. Admiral is within its right to decide how it scores the data using its commercial discretion – so it isn't for me to say that it can't score the data in that way. But I don't find its process to be unreasonable or unfair as it looks at the data as a complete picture, which is a reasonable reflection of an individual's driving habits over the lifetime of a policy. This also means that it can take time for scores to improve as the new scoring will be considered alongside the historic scoring. I also note that while some journeys may have started before the night driving window (10:00 pm to 4:00 am), some of these journeys later fell within the window – so it isn't unreasonable for Admiral to treat the journey as such.

While I recognise Mr B is of the view that there must have been a problem with the telematics device, I haven't seen anything to suggest this is the case. The data provided by Admiral is data that was considered when scoring, and doesn't necessarily reflect instances where he was penalised as this data, as explained above, was looked at as a whole. Admiral has also confirmed that it has a process in place to remove data that is inaccurate or is obviously incorrect. But Mr B's data wasn't found to have any anomalies.

Had Mr B felt there was a problem with the device, he could have raised this with Admiral during his time on cover, in which it could have been investigated further. I haven't seen anything to suggest this happened. On balance, I think it is reasonable to conclude that a policyholder would contact their insurer if they felt there was a problem with the device given the consequences the scoring can have on the policy and future renewals.

Ultimately, Mr B made the decision to cancel his policy – which he is entitled to do under the contract of insurance he holds. However, this is subject to the policy terms. These confirm that if Mr B cancels his policy after the 14 day cooling off period then he will be required to pay a cancellation charge of £160. Mr B has indicated that he was provided with this information at the start of the policy. So Mr B had enough information to understand what would happen in the event of cancellation. I don't find this fee to be inconsistent with other insurers on the market given the cost of installation, removal and administering of the devices. So, I don't find it unreasonable for Admiral to exercise its right to charge a cancellation fee in this case.

My final decision

So, for the reasons I have explained above, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr B to accept or reject my decision before 8 January 2026.

Oliver Collins
Ombudsman