

## **complaint**

Mr O's complaint is that Lloyds TSB Bank Plc (Lloyds) mis-sold him a payment protection policy with a loan in 1999.

## **background**

Lloyds agreed that Mr O had been mis-sold PPI and made him an offer to put him back in the position he would have been in if he hadn't taken his loan without PPI. The amount Lloyds offered was £3,589.90.

Mr O is very upset with the way that Lloyds handled this complaint and feels he should be compensated further for the delays and administrative problems he faced.

Our adjudicator thought the way Lloyds worked out how much Mr O had lost out was fair. Mr O didn't agree with this view and asked for an ombudsman to look at the final decision.

## **my findings**

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

Lloyds made an offer for this complaint and Mr O hasn't complained that the amount was wrong so I won't look into that or the calculation of the offer made other than to say that it is in line with the approach we would tell it to take.

I need to consider whether Mr O is entitled to be compensated because of the way Lloyds handled his case and the delays he faced.

In making this decision I've looked at the timetable of events from when the offer was made to Mr O. The key matters that occurred since the date of the offer are that Mr O accepted the offer Lloyds made at the beginning of November 2012. Mr O didn't receive payment until February 2013. He then didn't get any information that he asked for to know the offer was right until April 2013.

Mr O asked Lloyds to address the delays and wanted an additional payment for Lloyds failing to deal with Mr O in a direct and timely manner. He has requested additional compensation for the stress he felt in forcing the bank to resolve his case. Mr O has indicated the amount he wishes to be compensated is £350.

I have considered this case as a whole. My role isn't to punish the business but it is to look at both sides of the complaint and decide what we think is fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

I note that some of the issues from this complaint relate to Lloyds initially stating it couldn't find any PPI policy because the account reference was wrong. Mr O had written to Lloyds but incorrectly referenced his loan account number. It wasn't until almost a year later that Lloyds located the correct policy. In addition to this, Mr O referenced two account numbers on his complaint form ending 8890 and 9516. Lloyds only dealt with the account number ending 8890. A lot of the correspondence from Mr O after the offer was made was trying to confirm what account numbers it dealt with. Lloyds hadn't picked up the other account number ending 9516 on his complaint form and didn't see this until March 2013.

Based on the above, I think Lloyds could have done more to locate Mr O's policy and also to have reviewed the complaint more carefully and dealt with both loan accounts that Mr O complained about. This led to many delays and a lot of confusion to Mr O who was trying to work out if the offer was right.

Lloyds offered to pay £100 in compensation for these delays and administrative errors but I don't think that is enough. I think Lloyds should pay more compensation because its errors contributed to the delays and confusion suffered by Mr O. Because of this I direct Lloyds to pay Mr O £200 in compensation for the trouble and upset he experienced.

### **my final decision**

For the reasons I've set out above, I think Lloyds offer to Mr O was fair but the delays he experienced were not fair.

I direct Lloyds to pay compensation as I have set out above.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I am required to ask Mr O to accept or reject my decision before 10 July 2015.

Miranda Bates  
**ombudsman**