

The complaint

Mr I complains about the amount U K Insurance Limited, trading as Churchill Insurance, charged for his motor insurance policy.

All premium figures will be rounded for ease of reading.

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.

Our investigator thought Churchill acted fairly. I agree, and for the same reasons, so I don't think it's necessary for me to go over everything again in detail. Instead, I'll summarise the main points:

- Mr I held home insurance with Churchill. Ahead of the 2025 renewal, Churchill said the price would rise from £420 to £620 – an increase of nearly 50%.
- Mr I looked online and said he found the same Churchill policy available for a cheaper price – contrary to pricing rules. He got in touch with Churchill, and it agreed to reduce the renewal price to £475. Mr I said he later found Churchill policies available for £360 - £440. But he wasn't able to take out a policy in this price range.
- Each insurer is entitled to take its own view of risk and, based on that, whether to offer insurance cover to a particular policyholder – and, if so, at what price.
- Like most insurers, Churchill takes into account lots of different information when it decides how risky something is to insure. Even small changes in that risk information can generate different prices. Churchill has explained some of the many factors which can cause price fluctuations, such as changes to discounts, the level of cover, and when an offer was generated.
- In this case, when Mr I got in touch with Churchill, it applied a discretionary discount which reduced the renewal price to £500. After he increased the excess, it reduced to £475. On the first point, Churchill applied the discount to seek to keep Mr I as a customer. It's entitled to offer a retention discount and isn't required to apply it to the renewal price initially offered. And, on the second point, it's clear that an increased excess will usually decrease the price – and the reverse is also the case.
- Churchill initially said it found no evidence that it had offered a policy to Mr I for £440. After he noted that offer could be found in a transcript of an online chat, Churchill accepted it had indeed made that offer.
- It seems Churchill didn't record it as a formal offer – so when it later searched for such offers, it didn't find one at that price. Nonetheless, I would have expected Churchill to check more carefully before saying it hadn't made an offer.

- This offer was clearly less than the £475 offer, but I can see why. In short, it had slightly higher excesses than the £475 offer. So it makes sense that it was a little cheaper. And that means it's not a like-for-like comparison with the £475 offer.
- Whilst it would have been preferable for Churchill to find and explain this offer at an earlier stage, I don't think that would have had a material impact on this matter. This is only one point of Mr I's wider complaint. So I think it's likely he would have spent similar time on the matter, even if Churchill had dealt with the point earlier.
- Mr I also said he received offers from Churchill, in the range of £360 - £420. Churchill has shown these weren't like-for-like with the £475 offer either. For example, when Mr I first got the £360 quote, it wasn't based on full vehicle details. When the missing information was provided, the quote was updated and the offer became £475.
- Overall, this means Churchill offered a renewal price and later applied a retention discount – as its entitled to. A further reduction was made after the excess was increased. No other quotes were based on like-for-like information. And, once like-for-like information was provided, the quotes matched. Though Churchill made a mistake when it didn't find one of the offers, that had no material impact.
- Taking all of this into account, I consider Churchill acted within the relevant pricing rules, and fairly and reasonably.

My final decision

I don't uphold this complaint

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr I to accept or reject my decision before 7 May 2026.

James Neville
Ombudsman