

complaint

Mr and Mrs F say National Westminster Bank Plc (NatWest) mis-sold them a mortgage payment protection insurance (MPPI) policy.

background

This complaint is about a joint monthly premium MPPI policy taken out with a mortgage that started in 2010.

Our adjudicator didn't uphold the complaint. Mr and Mrs F 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 and Mrs F's case.

I've decided not to uphold Mr and Mrs F's complaint because:

- Taking into account the paperwork from the time and what Mr and Mrs F have told us, I think it's more likely that Mr and Mrs F knew they had a choice about whether to have the policy or not. They signed a document on which it shows that they'd selected MPPI and they also signed a direct debit which was solely for the PPI. The way the documents were set out I think it more likely that they chose the PPI knowing they didn't have to.
- NatWest didn't recommend the MPPI to Mr and Mrs F. So it didn't have to check if it was suitable for them. This means that NatWest didn't have to look at whether Mr and Mrs F already had other ways of making their mortgage repayments if their circumstances changed. But NatWest did have to give Mr and Mrs F enough information to decide for themselves if the policy was right for them. I think it's likely that they knew how the MPPI would've covered their mortgage repayments.
- I think NatWest could've explained the cost of the policy better than it did. But even if it had, I think Mr and Mrs F would've still bought it given the level and potential term of the benefit.
- It's possible NatWest didn't point out the main things the policy didn't cover. But it's unlikely Mr and Mrs F would have been affected by any of these.
- Originally both Mr and Mrs F said that they had no health issues at the point of sale. Latterly Mr F's representatives have said that Mr F had been on prescribed medication for 20 years. This indicates to me that if Mr F was on the medication he says he was then he didn't consider this to be a health issue at the time of the sale of the PPI. As a consequence of this I'm not persuaded he'd of decided differently if better informed about the things the policy didn't cover.

I've considered all the evidence and everything which has been said. I'm not persuaded that there has been any unfairness here or that if better informed Mr and Mrs F would have done anything differently.

my final decision

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

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I am required to ask Mr and Mrs F to accept or reject my decision before 13 November 2015.

Rod Glyn-Thomas
ombudsman