

complaint

Mr O says Lloyds Bank plc mis-sold him a payment protection insurance ("PPI") policy.

background

Mr O bought the policy in 1980 at the same time as taking out a credit card.

Our adjudicator didn't uphold the complaint. Mr O 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's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

Where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive or contradictory (as some of it is here), I reach my decision on the balance of probabilities – that is, what I consider is most likely to have happened in light of the available evidence and the wider existing circumstances.

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 O's case.

I've decided not to uphold Mr O's complaint because:

- I think it's likely that Lloyds made Mr O aware that the PPI was optional and that he chose to take it. Although I accept it is possible PPI wasn't discussed, it is equally likely it was, and Mr O now can't remember this.
- Lloyds accepts that it probably recommended the PPI to Mr O, but it doesn't look as if it was unsuitable for him based on what I've seen of his circumstances at the time.
- It's possible the information Lloyds gave Mr O about the PPI wasn't as clear as it should have been. But it's unlikely Mr O would have been affected by any of the main things the policy didn't cover. And the policy was competitively priced and had a reasonable benefit. So I don't think better information would've stopped him buying it.

I've taken into account all of Mr O's comments, but the points he's made don't change my conclusion.

my final decision

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

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr O to accept or reject my decision before 11 August 2016.

Caroline Stirling

ombudsman