

The complaint

Mr D is unhappy with the service he received from Barclays Bank UK PLC, trading as Barclaycard, surrounding a direct debit ("DD") instruction on his account.

What happened

Mr D's DD instruction to Barclays went unpaid in October 2022. Mr D felt there was no reason the DD shouldn't have been paid and felt that it had been an error or mistake by Barclays which had caused the non-payment. So, he raised a complaint.

Barclays responded to Mr D and explained that they hadn't been able to determine why the DD had failed but that no adverse reporting had been made by them in regard to the unpaid DD. Barclays also apologised to Mr D for the poor service he'd received when he'd brought his concerns about the matter to them and made a payment of £50 to Mr D as compensation for any upset or inconvenience he may have incurred. Mr D wasn't satisfied with Barclays' response and wanted Barclays to delete the Barclays system entry and statement entry relating to the missed DD. So, he referred his complaint to this service.

One of our investigators looked at this complaint. They felt that it was more likely than not that Barclays had been responsible for the DD not being taken correctly, and so they recommended that Barclays should make a further payment of £100 to Mr D to fairly compensate him for the trouble he'd incurred. However, our investigator felt that because the DD had been missed – regardless of whose fault that was – the system and statement entries were correct and so shouldn't be amended. Mr D remained dissatisfied, so the matter was escalated to an ombudsman for a final 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.

Barclays have accepted the recommendation put forwards by our investigator that they should pay a further £100 to Mr L to fairly compensate him for the trouble and upset he's incurred here. And I can also confirm that this further compensation amount feels fair to me, given what's happened here.

But Mr D isn't happy that Barclays aren't being instructed by this service to amend the system entry and statement entry relating to the missed DD – which he feels may be viewed negatively by Barclays when considering potential future lending requests from him – and feels that because the missed DD is considered to have most likely occurred because of some action or inaction of Barclays that the entries should be amended.

I can appreciate Mr D's concerns here. However, regardless of who was at fault, the DD payment was missed, and so I'm satisfied that the system and statement entries which declare this are correct. And I'm similarly satisfied that instructing Barclays to amend these entries would mean instructing Barclays to change correct and accurate entries to incorrect and inaccurate ones – which is not something I would reasonably consider instructing.

Additionally, Barclays have confirmed that they haven't recorded any adverse information about the missed DD which would be considered by them regarding any potential future lending requests Mr D might make.

As such, I'm satisfied both that the system and statement entries accurately record what happened – as would be expected – and also that there's no potential ongoing adverse impact to Mr D – as a result of the corrective steps that Barclays have already taken. And so, I won't be upholding this aspect of Mr D's complaint.

I realise this might not be the outcome Mr D was wanting, but I trust he'll understand, given what I've explained, why I've made the final decision that I have.

Putting things right

Barclays must make a payment of £100 to Mr D.

My final decision

My final decision is that I uphold this complaint against Barclays Bank UK PLC, trading as Barclaycard, on the basis explained above.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr D to accept or reject my decision before 13 June 2023.

Paul Cooper
Ombudsman