

## **The complaint**

Miss H complains about the renewal of her motor insurance policy with U K Insurance Limited (UKI). Reference to UKI includes its agents.

## **What happened**

The circumstances leading to the complaint are well known to both parties, so I don't repeat them in full here. In summary, Miss H had difficulty renewing her car insurance policy with UKI. She made an unsuccessful attempt to make the necessary payment before the renewal date. Miss H contacted UKI on several occasions about this. She says she didn't receive timely or satisfactory responses. UKI told her its systems initially showed that the payment had been made, but Miss H knew that wasn't the case. She was worried she might be driving without insurance in place and is concerned this may be happening to other drivers.

Miss H complained to UKI about the service she received. She said she hadn't received a promised call-back, UKI didn't make a note of her calls, the on-line portal showed - incorrectly - that the renewal premium had been paid and UKI ignored her request for a recording of a call.

UKI upheld Miss H's complaint. It apologised for the service she had received and concluded that there'd been a system error around payment. UKI said it didn't hold any bank details for Miss H, so no payment had been attempted. It said Miss H hadn't been uninsured as a result of what had gone wrong. UKI paid Miss H compensation of £100 in relation to service issues. Miss H didn't think that was fair and pursued her complaint.

Miss H is concerned that other drivers may think they have insurance in place when they do not. She says if she wasn't able to make payment before renewal she may have driven uninsured and been stopped by the police or have no cover following an accident. Miss H says it was only her persistence that led to her being able to make payment before renewal. She says this matter has caused her distress and inconvenience.

Miss H wants formal, written acknowledgement of all of UKI's service failures in her case; reassurance that its systems and safeguards will be reviewed; training or review processes put in place to ensure customers are treated appropriately; for UKI to check that another person's account has been handled correctly; and compensation reflecting the seriousness of the failures and her distress and inconvenience.

One of our Investigators looked at what had happened. She said this service's role isn't to punish or regulate businesses. The Investigator said she could see why Miss H was frustrated. She said UKI confirmed there was no lapse in cover. The Investigator said UKI didn't have payment details for Miss H on its system. She thought the compensation UKI had already paid was fair and reasonable.

Miss H didn't agree with the Investigator. She said the Investigator hadn't addressed all her concerns - for example her concerns about UKI's compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), as it revealed to her the last four digits of a bank card that didn't belong to her. She said the issues here affect other drivers. Miss H referred to

previous issues she'd raised with UKI and said it's clear there are systemic failures in UKI's process. She says UKI needs to take action to ensure this doesn't happen again. Miss H said she doesn't dispute the compensation of £100 paid by UKI. She reiterated and expanded what she wants UKI to do to put matters right.

The Investigator considered what Miss H said but didn't change her view. Miss H asked that an Ombudsman consider her complaint, so it 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.

In this decision I'm dealing with the issues Miss H raised with UKI and which it addressed in its final response of 14 August 2025. It's clear Miss H has very strong feelings about this matter. She has provided detailed submissions to support the complaint, which I have read and considered. I trust she will not take as a discourtesy the fact that I focus on what I consider to be the central issue, that is whether UKI acted fairly and reasonably.

It's useful to reflect on the role of this Service. This Service isn't intended to regulate or punish businesses for their conduct – that is the role of the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA). Instead, we resolve informally individual complaints between a consumer and a business.

When things go wrong, we ask the business to put things right by placing the consumer, as far as is possible, in the position they would have been in if the problem hadn't occurred. We don't have the power to make rules for financial businesses, such as requiring them to review systems or processes, or implement training.

I've taken into account the law, regulations and good practice. Above all, I've considered what's fair and reasonable. I don't uphold this complaint because I think the steps UKI have taken to resolve it are fair and reasonable. I'll explain why below.

It's not disputed that Miss H faced difficulties in renewing her policy and that UKI didn't deal with her concerns in a timely or efficient way. After investigation, UKI concluded that a systems error was the root cause of what happened here. On balance, based on what I've seen, I think that's more likely than not the cause of Miss H's account showing a payment that hadn't in fact been made.

I've looked at the chronology of events. There was no time Miss H was uninsured. I can appreciate that she was frustrated at having to attend to this matter on more than one occasion and having to repeat her concerns. UKI has acknowledged it provided Miss H with poor customer service, including not acting on her request for a recording of a phone call.

Miss H is concerned about UKI's compliance with GDPR, as it relayed to her the last four digits on a bank card that didn't belong to her. I've seen no evidence that UKI breached GDPR in relation to Miss H's own data. UKI has confirmed that it didn't retain Miss H's card details. We don't have power in this case to direct UKI in relation to an account held by someone other than Miss H. I note that Miss H has already raised this matter with the Information Commissioner's Office.

I don't think it's necessary for the fair resolution of this complaint to require UKI to produce a formal, written acknowledgement of all of its service failures, as both parties are aware of what's occurred. Miss H has confirmed that she does not dispute the compensation of £100

UKI has already paid. In all the circumstances, I agree that the compensation UKI has already paid is fair and reasonable in this case. I don't require it to do anymore.

**My final decision**

My final decision is that I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss H to accept or reject my decision before 9 March 2026.

Louise Povey

**Ombudsman**