

The complaint

Miss C complains about how Aioi Nissay Dowa Insurance UK Limited (“Aioi”) dealt with a claim she made on a car insurance policy after her car was stolen.

What happened

The details of the complaint are well known by both parties, so I won’t repeat them again here. Instead, I’ll focus on providing my reasons for my decision.

What I’ve decided – and why

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

Having done so, I agree with the conclusions reached by the investigator that Aioi has done enough to put matters right and the complaint should not be upheld. I do so for the following reasons:

- Miss C’s car was stolen, this will naturally cause inconvenience while a claim is settled. Plans may have to be rearranged and alternative transport sought. Miss C did not have enhanced courtesy car cover on her policy so unfortunately, she had to source her own alternative transport.
- Aioi has admitted there were instances where it gave poor service. It wasn’t clear about how the claim was progressing and it gave misleading and confusing timescales to Miss C when she called. I understand why this would have caused Miss C confusion and frustration.
- Aioi were entitled to conduct normal verification checks before authorising the claim and while Miss C did provide information about her change of address in the claim notification, she didn’t update Aioi about a change in occupation. Such factors can change how a policy is rated and ultimately impact how much is paid out on a claim, or in the extreme circumstances where an insurer wouldn’t have offered cover at all, it may mean a claim is not met at all. I was pleased to see in this case, once the policy details were updated Aioi proceeded to pay the claim.
- Aioi has said it could have identified earlier that the information it held and that which Miss C had provided differed. However, simply because it has said this, I don’t think this means the claim was overly delayed to the extent Aioi should be responsible for all the losses Miss C has claimed, some which I have mentioned above are a naturally incurred inconvenience when a car is stolen.
- Settlement was made within a month of the car being stolen which is relatively quick. So while there may have been a delay, I think this was minimal in the overall circumstances. A referral to underwriters was made within seven days of the Miss C confirming the vehicle had not been recovered and that she wished to proceed with a claim.

- Aioi apologised for its poor service and initially offered Miss C £125 compensation. It later increased this to £150. Having considered all the circumstances of the case, I think this is a fair figure which appropriately reflects the impact its errors had.
- Miss C has complained about how Aioi dealt with her complaint and how long it took to provide a response. Complaint handling itself is not a regulated activity and therefore is not something I can consider in this decision. However, I can appreciate why this would have added to the frustration Miss C felt.

For these reasons, I do not uphold this complaint. I think Aioi has fairly acknowledged its service failings and offered a reasonable amount of compensation to put things right.

My final decision

My final decision is that I do not uphold Miss C's complaint against Aioi Nissay Dowa Insurance UK Limited.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss C to accept or reject my decision before 22 November 2023.

Alison Gore
Ombudsman