

## **The complaint**

Mr L complains that MoneyGram International Limited failed to use a “key reference” when transferring money.

## **What happened**

Mr L says he made two payments in August 2023 to a foreign account using MoneyGram. He says it should have requested the recipient use a “key reference” before authorising the transfer. Mr L says that jeopardised the safety of his money but accepts the recipient received the money. Mr L says there was a similar problem in 2022 and says MoneyGram isn’t following its process.

MoneyGram says it successfully made the two transfers in August 2023 and says its terms and conditions make clear when it requires the key reference to be used, which is not for transfers to an account directly.

Mr L brought his complaint to us, and our investigator didn’t uphold it and explained why we can’t look again at the 2022 issue. The investigator thought MoneyGram acted in line with agreed account terms and conditions and didn’t require a key reference to be used for this transaction.

Mr L doesn’t accept that view.

## **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 come to the overall view that I don’t uphold this complaint. I make clear, as the investigator has, that I can’t consider the complaint about the 2022 transfer, as we have previously dealt with that.

I have looked carefully at MoneyGram’s terms and conditions which I think Mr L would have agreed to when he transferred the money. I can see that MoneyGram makes clear that a key reference is required for certain transaction which include a cash pick up and a home delivery. A key reference is not needed for a direct deposit. I’m satisfied that Mr L made a transfer using MoneyGram directly to an account. So, it follows I don’t think MoneyGram made a mistake or acted unfairly by allowing the transfer to be made without additional security such as the key reference. I find it acted in line with agreed account terms and conditions. In other words, MoneyGram did what it said it would.

I can see that the recipient did receive the money and so it’s difficult to see why Mr L complains about that, as the method of transfer ought to have been clear to him before he made the transaction. I would have expected Mr L not to have used this method if he was concerned about the risk the recipient would not receive the money.

Overall, I’m satisfied MoneyGram acted as it said it would and I find this now brings an end

to what we in trying to resolve this dispute informally can do.

**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 L to accept or reject my decision before 9 May 2024.

David Singh  
**Ombudsman**