

## **The complaint**

Mrs A complains that Somerset Bridge Insurance Services Limited trading as Go Skippy (SBIS) unfairly handled the cancellation of her motor insurance policy.

## **What happened**

The circumstances of this case are known to both parties, but in summary Mrs A had a motor insurance policy, arranged by SBIS. In March 2025, SBIS informed Mrs A about her upcoming policy renewal. Shortly after renewal, Mrs A made changes to the policy which initially led to a reduction in the premium. But Mrs A made a further change in May 2025 which resulted in a premium increase. Mrs A said she wasn't informed about the new monthly payment and decided not to continue with the policy and so asked SBIS to cancel the policy. SBIS agreed to waive the cancellation fee and informed Mrs A that there was an owed premium of £191.18. However, this included the cancellation fee. Unhappy with SBIS's handling of the cancellation, Mrs A complained.

SBIS upheld the complaint in part as it failed to waive the £75 cancellation fee as previously agreed. It corrected this, and waived a further £35, but explained the remaining £81.18 was owed under the policy. As Mrs A remained unhappy, she referred her complaint to this Service.

Our Investigator didn't uphold the complaint as while they acknowledged SBIS hadn't provided a breakdown of the remaining charges, they were satisfied, on balance, that SBIS had acted fairly, and in line with its terms of business.

Mrs A disagreed and asked for an Ombudsman to make a final decision. In summary, she said SBIS didn't provide the documents needed to support its position, the finance provider confirmed no balance was owed, yet SBIS's figures kept changing and didn't back this up with a statement or breakdown. Mrs A also highlighted repeated administrative errors by both SBIS and the finance provider and said it wasn't reasonable for the Investigator to rely on assumptions when SBIS hadn't produced the required evidence.

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.

While I recognise Mrs A will be disappointed with my decision, I don't uphold this complaint. I'll explain why.

I know I've summarised the circumstances of this case in less detail than presented. But I want to assure both parties that I've carefully considered all the information provided. I may not respond to every point or piece of evidence. But I've focused on the issues I consider to be key to the outcome of the case. This isn't meant as a discourtesy but reflects the informal

nature of this Service – and the rules this Service are expected to adhere to enable me to do this.

I should first make clear that I am only considering the actions of SBIS in this decision. Mrs A's policy was arranged and administered by SBIS but was paid monthly through a finance agreement with a finance provider. Some of the issues raised by Mrs A are the responsibility of the finance provider – for example, confirming the revised schedule of payments, the direct debits taken, and informing her that no balance was owed. So, while I understand why Mrs A considers the issues to be inherently linked, I can't hold SBIS responsible for the actions of the finance provider. Any concerns surrounding the finance agreement need to be put to the finance provider.

Therefore, the outstanding issues for me to decide are whether SBIS acted fairly in requesting Mrs A pay the remaining balance under the policy, whether it reasonably informed Mrs A about the changes to her policy following the mid-term adjustments, and whether SBIS made Mrs A aware of the applicable charges under the policy.

Relevant regulatory rules say firms must provide information that is clear, fair and not misleading. So, I have carefully considered the information provided to Mrs A following the renewal of her policy. This includes the terms of business which confirm that if a policyholder makes an amendment to their policy after inception, there is an administrative charge of £50. This also explained that if a policyholder decides to cancel the policy more than 14 days after inception, then they would be required to pay a £75 cancellation charge. So on balance, I'm satisfied Mrs A was given sufficient information to understand what charges applied to the policy should she make a change after inception, or cancel the policy.

As Mrs A made an adjustment to her policy through SBIS's online platform, she incurred a fee of £35. While I accept the £35 reduced fee isn't explicitly detailed within the terms of business, this amount is more favorable than the £50 fee stated. And I'm satisfied SBIS provided Mrs A with enough information to know that a change to her policy would incur a fee. So, I don't find the application of this fee to be unreasonable in the circumstances.

I understand the finance provider told Mrs A no balance was owed, and she didn't receive confirmation of her new direct debit payments. But these are issues that relate the finance agreement. As I have explained earlier, if Mrs A is unhappy with the information she received from the finance provider, she would need to raise this with them directly.

That said, SBIS had a duty to inform Mrs A about the impact of any changes to the policy. And I'm satisfied it did this as it wrote to her to confirm that the amendment led to an increase in the policy premium. So, I'm satisfied SBIS did what was required of it and gave Mrs A clear notice that her overall premium had increased.

As Mrs A was unhappy that she hadn't been informed of the increase to her monthly payments, she requested SBIS cancel the policy. SBIS agreed and confirmed it would waive the £75 cancellation fee in an attempt to resolve things. But upon cancellation, SBIS asked Mrs A to pay a balance of £191.18, which included the £75 cancellation fee it agreed to waive.

Once deducted, this left an owed balance of £116.18. SBIS said this represents the remaining cost in providing cover under the policy and its applicable fees, less the payments Mrs A made to date. However, in recognition of its failure to waive the cancellation fee, it waived a further £35 (a reduction of £25, and another of £10) bringing the remaining owed balance to £81.18.

I appreciate why Mrs A felt the changing figures suggested errors, and may have caused some confusion. But SBIS has since provided this Service with a breakdown of the policy premium. This details the total cost of cover charged by the insurer, the broker's fee, the cost of mid-term adjustments, and interest applied by the finance company. It also confirms the total payments Mrs A made up to the point of cancellation.

I can't share this information with Mrs A due to its commercially sensitive nature, and I recognise this will be frustrating. But I hope I can provide some assurance that this has been considered independently of both parties to the complaint. Having considered this information, I'm satisfied SBIS hasn't acted unfairly and the remaining premium reflects the cost of cover up to the point of cancellation, less the cancellation fee and the goodwill reduction made by SBIS in response to her complaint.

Insurance premiums aren't calculated based on a daily rate, and the total premium owed under a policy primarily represents the cost for an insurer in covering the risk of a policyholder making a successful claim within the term of cover. These costs consider several different things. In Mrs A's case, this means that even though she made several monthly payments, those payments didn't necessarily cover the insurer's total cost of providing cover up to the date she cancelled.

SBIS didn't determine the overall premium owed under the policy as ultimately this is set by the insurer. But, on balance, while SBIS did make an administrative error in its handling of the cancellation by failing to waive the cancellation fee, I find that it has taken reasonable steps to resolve things here. So, I won't be directing SBIS to do anything more here.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs A to accept or reject my decision before 20 March 2026.

Oliver Collins  
**Ombudsman**