

## **complaint**

Mr B says Barclays Bank Plc (trading as Woolwich) mis-sold him a mortgage payment protection insurance (MPPI) policy.

## **background**

This complaint is about a monthly premium MPPI policy taken out with a mortgage in 2006.

Our adjudicator didn't uphold the complaint. Mr B disagreed with the adjudicator's opinion so the complaint has been passed to me.

## **my findings**

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

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

I've decided not to uphold Mr B's complaint because:

- I think Woolwich made Mr B aware that the MPPI was optional and that he chose to take it. Mr B's mortgage application has a 'Yes' box and a 'No' box for MPPI. The 'Yes' box is ticked and above it is written '*I am taking on a bigger mortgage and would like my payments protecting*'. I've taken into account that Mr B's representatives have said he could've been pressured. But Mr B's application suggests he wanted to take out the policy and I haven't seen anything else to suggest he didn't have a real choice.
- Woolwich recommended the MPPI to Mr B, but it doesn't look as if it was unsuitable for him based on what I've seen of his circumstances at the time. The policy provided up to 24 months cover per claim for unemployment, accident and sickness. So I think it could've been useful to Mr B. Mr B's representatives have said he had indefinite sick pay. But this information was provided for Mr B's previous job, not his job when he took out the mortgage. A demands and needs has been completed as part of the mortgage application. This suggests Mr B said he didn't have sufficient sickness cover at the time.
- I've considered Mr B's savings, as I know Mr B was due to receive a lump sum shortly after taking out the mortgage. But his application suggests he took out a lower policy benefit to take this money into account. It says Mr B has decided to only cover part of the mortgage payment with PPI and that he will use the money from his pension to cover the difference. So I don't think his savings made the policy unsuitable.
- The cost of the policy was shown on the mortgage application. So I think Mr B would've understood how much he would need to pay for it.
- It's possible Woolwich didn't point out the main things the policy didn't cover. But it's unlikely Mr B would've been affected by any of these.

I've taken into account Mr B's comments. But these points don't change my conclusion.

**my final decision**

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

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr B to accept or reject my decision before 13 November 2015.

Amy Osborne  
**ombudsman**