

## **The complaint**

Mr A complains about a malfunctioning payment reminder device in the car he was supplied by Go Car Credit Limited (“GCC”).

## **What happened**

Mr A was supplied with a car on a hire purchase agreement with GCC in June 2024. Included in the car was a device which when working correctly, would alert Mr A when he turned the engine on if his agreement was in arrears.

Mr A contacted GCC in September 2025 to say that the device wasn’t working correctly and told them that the device was sounding alerts even when he was driving, or when the car was parked, or locked, with the ignition turned off.

GCC tried to speak to Mr A on the phone but couldn’t get hold of him, and later in September they contacted him by email to say they had reviewed the device and could see that it had been going off excessively, so they wanted to apologise but said that a software update had now happened, and they’d been assured the device was now working correctly and they offered him £25 by way of compensation.

An email discussion ensued about an appropriate level of compensation, with GCC increasing their offer to £75 and confirming this in their final response letter (FRL) in October 2025.

Mr A didn’t accept this and brought his complaint to our service. It was investigated, and while this was happening, GCC made an offer to settle the complaint of £200 for the distress and inconvenience caused. The investigator here gave their opinion that this offer was fair, but Mr A didn’t agree and asked for an Ombudsman to make a final decision. He said that he felt his previous request for £615 was the fair resolution, and £200 didn’t fairly recognise the distress and inconvenience caused to him. The case has come to me for a final decision.

After this and before I picked the case up, GCC made contact to say that they now believed that there was no evidence of the device being faulty while Mr A was driving as had been claimed, so they didn’t feel upholding the complaint was fair, but they would honour the £200 offer as a gesture of goodwill.

## **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’ve reached the same overall conclusions as the investigator, and for broadly the same reasons. If I haven’t commented on any specific point, it’s because I don’t believe it’s affected what I think is the right outcome. Where evidence has been incomplete or contradictory, I’ve reached my view on the balance of probabilities – what I think is most likely to have happened given the available evidence and wider circumstances.

In considering this complaint I've had regard to the relevant law and regulations; any regulator's rules, guidance and standards, codes of practice, and (if appropriate) what I consider was good industry practice at the time. Mr A was supplied with a car under a hire purchase agreement. This is a regulated consumer credit agreement which means we're able to investigate complaints about it.

I don't agree with GCC's more recent communication about the fact they don't now believe the device was going off when Mr A was driving, as they've provided no evidence to this end. Alongside this, I don't think it's fair to agree with a customer something was faulty and then decide perhaps it wasn't. So, I will be considering the case as an overturn of their original decision when they admitted the fault and offered £75 compensation.

The fault was reported to GCC on 10 September 2025, and Mr A didn't make himself available to speak to GCC about it. It seems it was fixed by 24 September 2025, so it took two weeks to resolve. It's possible that the device wasn't giving out an alarm when Mr A was driving as GCC have now claimed, but I've seen no evidence of this either way. Alongside this, there seems to be little argument that it wasn't working properly. GCC agreed it was alerting excessively, and Mr A had also told us it was going off when the engine was switched off and he wasn't in the car, which hasn't been disputed.

As such, I'm satisfied there was a fault, and that Mr A was caused distress and inconvenience by the fault. However, I'm not persuaded that the details provided to us by Mr A warrant a payment of more than the £200 offered now by GCC. The fault didn't prevent the car being used and was dealt with in two weeks from being reported to GCC.

I'm satisfied that £200 is a fair figure to compensate Mr A for the distress and inconvenience caused based on the testimony provided to our service, and so this is the figure GCC should pay to Mr A.

### **Putting things right**

I instruct GCC to pay Mr A £200 for the distress and inconvenience caused by the fault with the payment reminder device in his car.

### **My final decision**

I am upholding this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr A to accept or reject my decision before 25 March 2026.

Paul Cronin  
**Ombudsman**