

The complaint

Mr D complains that his carer, Miss X, as an authorised card holder, was unable to use his credit card for online purchases on two occasions.

What happened

Mr D held a credit card account with MBNA and another with Halifax Bank. They are part of the same banking group. I gather Miss X has power of attorney for Mr D, though I have not seen confirmation of this, apart from an application form. Mr D applied for Miss X to be an authorised card holder for both accounts. The process was completed for the Halifax account. On 24 February 2022 an email was sent to Miss X explaining that she needed to complete the registration process for MBNA. I gather this was not done.

While Mr D was abroad Miss X tried to make two purchases which required authorisation and this was unable to be completed by her. Mr D had to contact MBNA and he complained. MBNA accepted that it hadn't provided a suitable service and offered him £40 for one transaction and £80 for another. Mr D also asked an online chat service whether his card was still linked to a charity. It could not tell him but directed him to a customer service phone number. Mr D felt this was poor service. He also pointed out that he had been able to update his postcode with one bank and this information was shared with the other. He felt the information for Miss X as an authorised cardholder should have been handled jointly so that the completed registration information for Halifax should have been applied to the MBNA card account.

Mr D brought a complaint to this service where it was considered by one of our investigators who didn't recommend it be upheld. During the course of her enquiries MBNA offered to increase the compensation by £150. Our investigator considered this was fair taking into account the customer journey.

Mr D didn't agree and he felt MBNA had been economical with the truth. He said the whole matter had caused them both stress.

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 decided I should not uphold this complaint. I will explain why.

I appreciate Mr D was able to update his postcode for both banks, by notifying one. However, the process for giving authorisation to another person is different from updating a postcode and MBNA is entitled to operate its own processes. It is reasonable for it to require separate notification from its sister bank and for it to require Miss X to have completed the necessary details. I can understand she may not have appreciated this, but in the absence of the final step being completed I cannot hold MBNA responsible for seeking authorisation from Mr D in relation to the two transactions. It did not have the necessary authority to contact Miss X about those transactions. As such, I think it was reasonable for MNBA not to speak to Miss X until the authorisation process had been completed. In doing so it was seeking to protect Mr D.

It is not clear what happened with the transactions or why they failed, but I gather they were subsequently resolved. This caused Mr D and Miss X some inconvenience and MBNA has offered compensation. I understand this will cover the additional costs incurred and also provide compensation for any distress or inconvenience suffered.

On the matter of Mr D's query about the charitable donations made by MBNA for each transaction he made I note the online chat system was unable to answer his question. However, it did refer him to a source which could address his query. MBNA has explained the chat system does not address all matters related to the account and while Mr D may have found it frustrating I do not think it merits compensation.

In conclusion, I think the compensation offered by MBNA is more than fair and reasonable and so I do not consider I can uphold this complaint.

My final decision

For the reasons set out above my final decision is that I do not uphold the complaint. I simply leave it to Mr D to decide whether he wishes to accept the compensation MBNA Limited has offered.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr D to accept or reject my decision before 1 July 2024.

lvor Graham Ombudsman