

complaint

Mr and Mrs S say HSBC Bank Plc mis-sold them a payment protection insurance (PPI) policy.

Mr and Mrs S bought the policy in 1999 at the same time as taking out a loan. The loan included an amount to pay for the policy. The policy covered Mr S only.

background

I issued a provisional decision on Mr and Mrs S's complaint in October 2015. I explained I didn't intend to uphold their complaint.

In summary this was because I thought HSBC made Mr and Mrs S aware the PPI was optional and that they chose to take it out. And although HSBC recommended the PPI to Mr and Mrs S, it didn't look as if it was unsuitable for them. The cost of the policy was shown, so I thought Mr and Mrs S would've understood how much the PPI would cost if they kept the policy for its full term. Mr and Mrs S would've received a limited refund of the PPI premium if they cancelled the policy early. But I didn't think this made the policy unsuitable or better information about this would've stopped them buying it. I also thought it was possible HSBC didn't point out the main things the policy didn't cover. But I didn't think Mr and Mrs S were affected by any of these.

Mr and Mrs S didn't respond to my provisional decision.

HSBC responded saying it had nothing further to add.

my findings

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

We've set out our general approach to complaints about the sale of PPI on our website and I've taken this into account in deciding Mr and Mrs S's case.

As neither party has provided any further information for me to consider, I don't uphold this complaint for the same reasons stated in my provisional decision.

my final decision

For the reasons set out above, I don't uphold Mr and Mrs S's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I am required to ask Mr and Mrs S to accept or reject my decision before 29 December 2015.

Amy Osborne
ombudsman