

The complaint

Mr R complains J.P. Morgan Europe Limited trading as Chase delayed a payment.

What happened

Mr R was sent a payment late at night on 2 October 2023. Mr R hadn't received the payment by 4 October so, after speaking to the sender, Mr R contacted Chase.

Chase said the payment was being checked, and then asked Mr R to confirm some of the sender's details. Mr R spoke to the sender again, gave Chase the information it asked for, and Chase released the payment.

Mr R complained to Chase, saying the person paying him didn't want to do business with him anymore as he'd had to question them about whether they'd paid. And Mr R was caused further distress as he then had to ask the sender for personal details.

Chase responded to say it had 72 hours to complete checks on payments. Chase said it had messaged Mr R on 4 October 2023 and the payment had been released the same day.

Chase accepted Mr R had contacted Chase before it contacted him, so it offered £50 to compensate for this.

Mr R brought his complaint to this service and an investigator looked into things, but didn't think Mr R's complaint should be upheld.

The investigator said the Payment Services Regulations (PSRs) say Chase had to credit Mr R's account by close of business the day following receipt.

The investigator agreed Chase had contacted Mr R for more information, and this could have caused reputational damage. But Chase didn't do anything wrong in asking for the information, so the investigator didn't think Chase needed to do more.

Mr R disagreed and said the payment was sent on 2 October 2023, so by crediting his account on 4 October 2023 Chase hadn't abided by the PSRs. Mr R said the main issue is he wasn't notified about the payment.

The investigator responded to say they were persuaded Chase would have contacted Mr R had he not got in contact first.

And the investigator said the payment to Mr R was sent around 10pm on 2 October 2023, so it wasn't unreasonable to count 3 October as the day Chase received the payment. Because of this, the investigator thought Chase had abided by the PSRs.

Mr R asked for an ombudsman to decide things.

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.

I've seen the information Chase holds about the payment Mr R received. From what I've seen, the payment wasn't received by Chase until 4 October 2023.

It's possible the sender's bank held the payment up to carry out its own checks, but whatever the reason I'm satisfied Chase didn't receive the payment until 4 October 2023.

Chase needed some further information about the sender before it could release the payment. But Mr R contacted Chase before it asked for the information, Mr R was asking where the payment was.

Chase responded to say it could see the payment, but needed some personal details from the sender. Mr R got this information and Chase released the payment soon after.

Chase always needed the information about the sender before it could release the payment. Mr R's said it was embarrassing asking for this information, but I don't think he had any other option if he wanted the payment released.

Chase is allowed to carry out checks on payments in and out, and I think the information it asked for was needed. It's unfortunate asking for this information caused Mr R distress, but I don't think Chase did anything wrong in asking for it.

Mr R also says the person sending him the money no longer wants to do business with him, because the payment was delayed. But I don't think this was Chase's fault. Chase didn't receive the payment until 4 October and I don't think it unnecessarily delayed the payment.

Since I don't think Chase received the payment until 4 October, it follows I think Chase has kept to the timescales in the PSRs. The PSRs say the payment should be released by the business day following receipt of the payment.

I think Chase could have released the payment the next day and still abided by the PSRs.

But I think Chase should have contacted Mr R about the payment sooner than it did. Like the investigator, I think Chase would have messaged Mr R at some point about the payment, but I think it should have been before Mr R contacted it.

Mr R has said his main issue is Chase didn't message him about the payment. I think the soonest Chase would have messaged Mr R was sometime on 4 October, I don't think it received the payment before this date.

I realise it seems to Mr R that he waited a couple of days for Chase to contact him, but I think Chase contacted Mr R the same day it received the payment.

Chase has offered £50 to compensate for not contacting Mr R sooner, and, in the circumstances, I think this is a fair offer.

But I don't think Chase needs to compensate Mr R for any delays to the payment, Chase had checks it had to carry out and did so, so I don't think it made any errors in crediting the payment when it did.

My final decision

My final decision is I uphold this complaint and J.P. Morgan Europe Limited trading as Chase should pay Mr R £50.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr R to accept or reject my decision before 25 March 2024.

Chris Russ
Ombudsman