

## **The complaint**

Mr B and Mrs B complain U K Insurance Limited (UKI) has charged them for home insurance policies it hasn't provided.

Mr B and Mrs B are being represented in this complaint by a family member, but as Mr B is the policyholder, and for ease, I've referred to him throughout.

## **What happened**

The circumstances of this complaint will be well known to both parties and so I've summarised events.

In January 2025 Mr B went into his bank to change his address and asked them to change the address on his home insurance policy. His bank said he would need to speak to his insurer to change his address. When Mr B spoke with UKI, he was told he didn't hold a home insurance policy with it.

Mr B cancelled his direct debit and raised a complaint. He was unhappy he had been paying premiums for several years but wasn't being provided with insurance.

On 4 March 2025 UKI issued Mr B with a final response to his complaint. It said when Mr B changed his address in 2013, it hadn't updated the correspondence address correctly. So, when Mr B called in January 2025, it provided incorrect information when it said he didn't hold a policy with it. It confirmed it had been insuring Mr B at his correct address since 2013. It agreed to pay Mr B £150 compensation as an apology.

Mr B raised a further complaint as he said UKI had requested premium following him cancelling his policy. He also said correspondence had been sent to an incorrect address.

On 3 July 2025 UKI issued Mr B with another final response to his complaint. It said it should have backdated the cancellation of his policy to January 2025 and so it would remove any outstanding balance due and remove any outstanding payment markers on his credit file. It paid Mr B £100 compensation. Mr B referred his complaints to this Service.

Our Investigator looked into things. She said she thought this Service were only able to consider events which had taken place after February 2019. She said she was satisfied Mr B did have home insurance with UKI and so he wasn't entitled to a refund of premiums. She said she thought the total of £250 compensation, and waiving of any outstanding balance was reasonable in the circumstances.

Mr B didn't agree with our Investigator. He said this had a major impact on him and his family, such as being afraid to take out a new home insurance policy. He said he paid thousands in premiums only to be told he wasn't insured.

I issued a provisional decision about this complaint. I told both parties I thought the entirety of Mr B's complaint fell within this Service's jurisdiction. In relation to the merits of Mr B's complaint I said:

*'I want to acknowledge I've summarised Mr B's complaint in less detail than he's presented it. I've not commented on every point he has raised. Instead, I've focused on what I consider to be the key points I need to think about. I mean no discourtesy by this, but it simply reflects the informal nature of this Service. I assure Mr B and UKI I've read and considered everything that's been provided.*

*UKI has acknowledged when Mr B called in January 2025, it incorrectly advised him that he didn't hold a policy. It has explained when Mr B changed his address with it in 2013, it failed to update his correspondence address. However, it has said Mr B's insured address was updated, and it has been providing cover for him at this address.*

*UKI has provided screenshots of its system along with a copy of Mr B's renewal notice from 2023. And I'm satisfied from this evidence it was providing Mr B with insurance for the correct address since he changed his address in 2013.*

*Unfortunately, because UKI failed to update Mr B's correspondence address, he hasn't received any documents in relation to his policy since 2013. However, I don't think this has had a material impact on Mr B. He has said he was aware premiums were being taken from his account and reasonably assumed he had an insurance policy in place, which he did.*

*As I'm satisfied the premiums Mr B has paid were insuring his property up until he cancelled his policy, it wouldn't be reasonable to require UKI to refund Mr B the premiums he has paid toward his policies.*

*I've taken into consideration what Mr B has said about the distress and inconvenience this situation has had on him. I acknowledge it was distressing for Mr B to be told he didn't hold a home insurance policy, particularly given he had been paying his premiums for a number of years. And he has had to spend unnecessary time contacting his bank and UKI to get to the bottom of this. Mr B has also suffered further distress and inconvenience following UKI chasing him for outstanding premium. However I've also taken into consideration that Mr B did have a policy in place.*

*Taking this all into consideration I think UKI waiving any outstanding premium it was chasing, ensuring there is no record of outstanding payment markers on Mr B's credit file, and paying him a total of £250 compensation is reasonable to acknowledge the impact to Mr B. I think this compensation places Mr B back in the position he would have been in, and fairly recognises the distress and inconvenience he has been caused by UKI's errors.*

UKI didn't provide me with any further comments or evidence to consider. Mr B's representative provided a detailed response but in summary he said:

- Mr B has been left traumatised by this situation. He does not like confrontation with anything involving legal matters.
- Mr B had occasions where he could have claimed on his policy but didn't in order to protect his premium.
- He has had many letters ignored, sent to incorrect addresses and an email sent to the wrong address.
- He has travelled to the bank four times in order to resolve this matter but each time

they have done nothing to help.

### **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 outcome to the one I reached previously for much the same reasons.

Some of the issues Mr B has highlighted are issues Mr B has experienced with his bank. For example, an email being sent to the wrong address, or the bank not providing his representative with assistance despite visiting on multiple occasions. These issues aren't something I can hold UKI responsible for.

However, I'm not disputing UKI has made errors and this has caused Mr B distress and unnecessary inconvenience. I've taken into consideration what Mr B has said about how these errors have impacted him alongside what I think is fair and reasonable in the circumstances. Having done so, I think the total of £250 compensation UKI has paid is reasonable. I think compensation of this amount fairly takes into consideration the distress Mr B has been caused believing he hadn't been insured, subsequently being chased for unpaid premium and the effort he has made in order to resolve things.

I appreciate Mr B has said he had occasions where he could have claimed on his policy but didn't in order to protect his premium. However, I've seen no reason why Mr B couldn't have made a claim under his policy had he wished to do so. Therefore, I'm not persuaded Mr B's decision not to make a claim under his policy has been influenced by the errors UKI are responsible for.

I know Mr B feels strongly that further compensation is due to him but for the reasons I've explained I don't require UKI to take any further action in relation to his complaint.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons I've outlined above I don't uphold Mr B and Mrs B's complaint about U K Insurance Limited.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr B and Mrs B to accept or reject my decision before 10 March 2026.

Andrew Clarke  
**Ombudsman**