

## **The complaint**

Mrs B complains about an additional payment that Admiral Insurance (Gibraltar) Limited took by direct debit after she cancelled her car insurance policy, and her experience of trying to contact Admiral to resolve the dispute.

## **What happened**

Mrs B cancelled her car insurance policy online on 19 August 2025, and she received a cancellation email the same day. That email confirmed she was due a refund of £45.70 which was a refund of premiums, net of a £60 administration charge. The cancellation email said the refund was due 'providing any payment we have recently applied for clears.'

On 21 August, a payment of £129.67 was taken from Mrs B's bank account by direct debit. She phoned Admiral to ask about this and was told that this was a direct debit payment that was applied for on 18 August, as per standard procedure. They also said the cancellation email referred to payments like this and confirmed that the cancellation refund figure of £45.70 took this payment into account.

Mrs B was unhappy with this explanation and complained to Admiral, who did not uphold the complaint but did waive the £60 administration charge as a gesture of goodwill. Mrs B was unhappy with this outcome, so she contacted this Service, seeking a full refund of the £126.67, the payment of the £45.70 premium refund and compensation for the financial loss, lost working hours and emotional distress caused.

An Investigator reviewed Mrs B's complaint and gave the opinion that Admiral did not need to take any more action, that the short delays caused by Admiral's virtual assistant were not material, and that the waiver of the £60 administration charge was fair under the circumstances. Mrs B disagreed and requested an Ombudsman's decision.

## **What I've decided – and why**

I have not upheld this complaint, and I will now explain why.

I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

To establish that Admiral have acted fairly, I need to be satisfied that the communications they provided to Mrs B about her payments, and about this cancellation, were clear, fair and not misleading.

I recognise Mrs B is unhappy Admiral took a further payment from her account after she cancelled the insurance policy, and she says Admiral should have told her about this before it did so. But I'm satisfied it did act fairly here. Mrs B cancelled the policy online, after which she received an email saying she would get a refund provided any payments it had applied for had cleared. In line with the payment schedule it sent Mrs B on 5 August 2025 Admiral

had already applied for the payment before Mrs B cancelled the policy. And it generally takes around three days for a payment to go through.

I can understand why Mrs B was unhappy the payment was taken out, but this is simply down to the timing of when she cancelled the policy which was during the time cycle for a payment to go through. And, as I said, Admiral did set out that the refund was subject to any payment clearing.

I do think Admiral could have been clearer in setting out that a payment may still go through if it had only recently been applied for. But Mrs B hasn't lost out because of this as the payment would always have been taken, and she did owe this.

Furthermore, having listened to the 21 August telephone call, I don't believe the use of the virtual assistant was onerous, nor the wait time excessive, nor the experience of reaching an agent particularly difficult.

Under the circumstances, I conclude that Admiral's offer to waive the cancellation charge was fair, and I will not be instructing Admiral to take any additional steps.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons I stated above, I am not upholding this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs B to accept or reject my decision before 17 March 2026.

Joshua Clement  
**Ombudsman**