

complaint

Mr T complains that Tradewise Insurance Company Limited didn't pay him for the loss of his vehicle after he made a claim on his motor trader insurance policy.

background

Mr T's vehicle was stolen from his drive in August 2014. It wasn't recovered. Tradewise looked into his claim and found several serious issues with it. It said there was no proof Mr T was the vehicle's legal owner at the time of the theft. The single key Mr T had provided wasn't for the stolen vehicle. There was no evidence he was a trader. And the vehicle may have been modified. Tradewise didn't settle the claim because of these concerns. But it said if Mr T was able to send it further relevant evidence it would consider it.

Our adjudicator thought Tradewise had acted reasonably. Mr T hadn't provided anything further to Tradewise in the eight months since it made its offer. Mr T then sent us further information. We asked him to send to Tradewise. Subsequently Tradewise said there was nothing new in what Mr T had provided. The adjudicator suggested he should give Tradewise the information it needed.

Mr T asked for a review of the complaint by an ombudsman.

my findings

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

I think Tradewise had good reason to refuse to settle the claim. Mr T needed to give it evidence that would resolve *all* the concerns it had. That meant showing proof that he owned the vehicle first of all. It also meant providing the correct key. Mr T says the key he'd already provided worked in the vehicle. Expert advice received by Tradewise showed that couldn't be right. Tradewise had told Mr T it needed proof of trading, such as company accounts or tax returns. He was also asked to show it that he'd removed a modified part from the vehicle.

Tradewise says the extra information provided by Mr T isn't new evidence about the issues it's raised. I know Mr T may have sent in some documents that hadn't been submitted before. But what was needed was something directly relevant to Tradewise's concerns. Mr T's representative says Mr T's provided documents from the previous owner that he couldn't have got hold of if he hadn't bought the car. But I agree with Tradewise that such documents aren't enough to show ownership. And the other issues remain.

In my opinion, Tradewise has acted reasonably to date in not settling Mr T's claim.

my final decision

My final decision is that I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr T to accept or reject my decision before 14 November 2016.

Susan Ewins
ombudsman

