

The complaint

Mrs M complains that Digital Moneybox Limited trading as Moneybox ('DML') delayed the sale of her shares and because of this she has lost out financially.

What happened

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties, so I won't repeat them again here. The facts are not in dispute, so I'll focus on giving the reasons for my decision. Below, I have highlighted some key dates I think are relevant to the complaint:

- 23 January 2022: Mrs M submits her withdrawal request.
- 24 January 2022: DML approve the withdrawal request.
- 25 January 2022: the withdrawal was submitted for execution and traded.
- 28 January 2022: funds were transferred to Mrs M's nominated bank account.

DML has offered £80 for what happened. Our investigator looked into the complaint and said this offer was fair and reasonable under the circumstances. But Mrs M is seeking an increased amount of compensation.

As an agreement couldn't be reached the matter has been passed to me for a 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 broadly agree with the conclusion reached by our investigator for the following reasons.

All parties agree that there was a delay in executing Mrs M's withdrawal request. When a business has caused a delay, I must firstly consider if there was any financial impact. Mrs M has said she wanted to sell her shares due to market volatility and she heavily relied on DMLs FAQs in making her decision.

The FAQs state: *'...when selling investments you may receive back a little more or less than you have chosen to withdraw. This is because prices change daily and it will take one working day to process the sale of your funds'.*

I do agree with Mrs M's interpretation of this statement and I don't think it's unreasonable that she expected the sale of her shares to be processed in one working day. Having said that, DML has said it didn't execute the sale of the shares sooner because it was required to carry out anti money laundering checks.

A financial firm like DML acts under several obligations. It is responsible to look after the money and assets that its customers entrust it to. And it must comply with anti-money laundering and terrorist finance requirements. When financial firms make these checks it can be frustrating for the customer but there are good reasons for them to be done – they ought to be thought of as a necessary inconvenience.

DML had a duty to ensure it was abiding by the laws and regulations relevant to its business. I've seen a copy of its process and I'm satisfied it acted in line with this. Mrs M has said she understands why these checks are necessary, but she is unhappy that this isn't made clear in DML's FAQs. Had she have known it might've taken longer than one working day to execute the sale of her shares she wouldn't have instructed DML to withdraw them. DML accepts it took slightly longer to complete Mrs M's request than it should've but for reasons I think are justified. Because of this it offered to put Mrs M back in the position she would've been in had the sale of the shares executed one day earlier than they did.

Mrs M wanted to sell her shares and it appears DML acted on the instruction promptly. Selling an investment is time sensitive so I can appreciate why DML accepted this instruction without full checks being complete. DML has accepted it caused a delay and calculated the difference and rounded up its offer of compensation to £80 to account for the impact its delay caused. I accept there was a delay, but I'm satisfied DML explained things clearly to Mrs M and its checks were reasonable.

I recognise the delay would've been frustrating for Mrs M and she has explained the toll this matter has taken on her. But I think this is a fair sum offered and I'm not inclined to say DML should pay any more. Overall, I think it was right to try work within its obligations and cannot see that it has acted unfairly or unreasonably.

My final decision

Digital Moneybox Limited trading as Moneybox has already made an offer to pay £80 to settle the complaint and I think this offer is fair in all the circumstances. So, my decision is that Digital Moneybox Limited trading as Moneybox should pay £80.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs M to accept or reject my decision before 28 November 2022.

Rajvinder Pnaiser
Ombudsman