

## **The complaint**

Mr R complains that Barclays Bank PLC (Barclays) didn't correct an error on his credit file when it identified it in 2018. Although it has now done so Mr R would like significantly more compensation than the £400 Barclays has already paid.

## **What happened**

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties so I won't repeat them again here. Instead, I will focus on giving the reasons for my 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 have reached the following conclusions:-

- Barclays accepts, having identified an issue with its loan reporting for Mr R to the Credit Reference Agencies (CRA's) in 2018 that, despite telling Mr R at the time it would resolve this it didn't. It has now corrected Mr R's credit file and paid £400 for the distress and inconvenience.
- I appreciate Mr R doesn't feel this is sufficient. Part of his reason is that he feels the compensation should penalise Barclays and act as a deterrent. As our investigator has correctly advised it's not our role to punish businesses. We look at the actions a business took and the impact on the consumer in looking at redress.
- When Mr R made Barclays aware of the incorrect information on his credit file in July 2023 it investigated and issued its final response letter in September 2023. It paid compensation and stated it would rectify Mr R's credit file. As I understand it if Barclays had correctly reported details of the loan this information would have come off Mr R's credit file in 2019. So, the incorrect information stayed on his credit file for approximately four years.
- I appreciate the difficult financial circumstances Mr R shared with us which led to a debt relief order in 2013 and that he has been trying to rebuild his credit history. He feels the default Barclays put on his account meant he lost his financial independence, couldn't get credit, and had to rely on others for financial support. I also appreciate he feels there is a link in being able to get credit once the default was removed.
- It's difficult to assess the direct impact Barclays actions had on Mr R. As our investigator stated lenders typically look at a range of factors when offering credit and these will vary from lender to lender. Mr R hasn't given us any direct proof that the default Barclays registered was the only reason for credit applications being declined. And Mr R only seems to have noticed the issue in July 2023, some years after the mistake was made, so it doesn't seem that during this time, any credit lender made

him aware that the Barclays default was the only issue preventing him getting credit.

- I appreciate the correlation Mr R has made of getting credit once the default was removed . I am sure removal of the default would have helped his overall credit score but again I have no specific evidence that was the sole factor that has led to him more recently being able to get credit.
- As I have no specific evidence that Barclays actions alone were responsible for any declined credit applications I can't reasonably ask Barclays to award more compensation for this reason. I appreciate Mr R has asked for compensation in the region of £1500 but I don't think this is reasonable. I think the £400 already paid is reasonable for the distress and inconvenience caused.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr R to accept or reject my decision before 26 March 2024.

Bridget Makins  
**Ombudsman**