

## complaint

This complaint is about a loan payment protection insurance ('PPI') policy taken out in 2009. Mr P says Lloyds Bank PLC (trading as Lloyds TSB Bank) mis-sold him the PPI.

## 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 PPI on our website and I've taken this into account in deciding Mr P's case.

I've decided the policy wasn't mis-sold because:

- I think Lloyds made it clear that Mr P didn't have to take out the PPI and he chose to take it out – although I can understand why he can't remember this.

I say this because I've seen a copy of Mr P's signed loan agreement. It has a section for PPI which required a tick and separate signature if PPI was wanted. There's a tick beside the option for PPI and Mr P has signed the form. So I think this indicates that he wanted PPI.

Although Mr P has complained that he didn't know that PPI was optional, the box in which he signed for PPI has a number of statements next to it. The second statement says '*This insurance is optional.*' So I can't fairly uphold on this basis.

- Lloyds recommended the PPI to Mr P so it had to check that the PPI was right for him – and based on what I've seen of his circumstances at the time, I think that it was. For example he wasn't affected by any of the exclusions to or limits on the PPI cover and he seems to have had a need for the cover.
- It's possible the information Lloyds gave Mr P about the PPI wasn't as clear as it should've been. But he chose to take it out - so it looks like he wanted this type of cover. And it seems like it would have been useful for him if something went wrong. It also looks like it was affordable. So I don't think better information about the PPI would have put him off taking out the cover.
- Which means Lloyds doesn't have to pay back all of the cost of the PPI to Mr P.

But Lloyds will pay back *some* of the cost of the PPI to Mr P because:

- When the policy was sold, Lloyds expected to get a high level of commission and profit share (more than 50% of the PPI premium) - so it should have told Mr P about that. Because Lloyds didn't tell Mr P, that was unfair.
- To put that right, Lloyds has basically offered to pay back the amount of commission and profit share that was above 50% of the PPI premium - and I think that offer is fair in this case.

I've thought about everything Mr P has said, but these points don't change my decision and I don't uphold this complaint.

**what the business needs to do**

Lloyds has to pay back to Mr P any commission and profit share it got that was more than 50% of the PPI premium. Lloyds should also pay back to Mr P any extra interest he paid because of that.

Lloyds should pay back to Mr P the extra he paid each month because the commission and profit share it got was more than 50% of the cost of PPI. Lloyds should also pay Mr P 8%\* simple interest on each payment.

\*Businesses have to take basic rate tax off this interest. Mr P can claim back the tax if he doesn't pay tax.

**my final decision**

The PPI policy wasn't mis-sold – so Lloyds Bank PLC does not have to pay back all of the cost of the PPI to Mr P.

But Lloyds Bank PLC does have to pay back to Mr P any commission and profit share it got that was more than 50% of the PPI premium.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I am required to ask Mr P to accept or reject my decision before 24 June 2018.

Daniel O'Shea  
**ombudsman**