

## **The complaint**

Mr T complains that the interest rate for a savings account he'd opened with Metro Bank Plc (Metro) wasn't showing correctly when he viewed his account online.

## **What happened**

On 7 December 2023, Mr T opened an Instant Access Savings account (IAS) with Metro. This account was offered with an interest rate of 5.22% AER if funded with a minimum balance of £500 within 28 days of being opened. Mr T funded the IAS account as required and also opened a fixed term deposit account (FTD) for a 12-month period.

After the accounts had been opened Mr T logged into his mobile app and noticed that the interest rate that was showing against his IAS account was different to the rate that had been advertised when opening the account. The interest rate showing against his FTD account on the app was correct.

On around 19 December 2023 Mr T complained to Metro. He thought he was receiving a lower interest rate than the rate that had been advertised when he opened his IAS account. And he said the incorrectly shown interest rate was causing him confusion and distress.

Metro investigated Mr T's concerns and issued its final response to his complaint on 1 January 2024. It upheld his complaint and accepted that the interest rate for its IAS accounts was showing incorrectly online. It explained this was a known technical issue affecting the interest rate shown for IAS accounts solely on its online platforms. And it reassured Mr T that the interest rate applicable to his IAS account was 5.22% AER as had been advertised when he opened the account and not 5.1% AER as was showing online.

Mr T was dissatisfied with Metro's response to his complaint; he wanted it to award compensation. So, he referred his complaint to our service. After his complaint was referred, Metro offered to pay Mr T £75 compensation.

Our investigator looked into Mr T's complaint. They were persuaded that Metro had accepted responsibility for what had happened and resolved the issue. They also thought the compensation offered to Mr T was fair and reasonable in the circumstances. But Mr T disagreed with our investigator's view of his complaint and asked for the matter to be referred to an ombudsman.

## **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'm aware that I've summarised the events of the complaint. I don't intend any discourtesy by this - it just reflects the informal nature of our service. I've concentrated on what I think are the key issues. I can assure Mr T and Metro that I've read everything that they've provided. So, if I've not mentioned something it's not because I haven't considered it. It's just that I

don't think I need to comment on it in order to reach what I think is a fair and reasonable outcome.

I'm sorry to hear about the difficulties Mr T experienced here. I can appreciate that he was caused confusion and distress by what happened. He believed the savings in his IAS account were earning a lower interest than had been advertised by Metro when the opened had been opened. I recognise that would have caused concern and required time on Mr T's part to speak with Metro about what had happened. Mr T has said this also caused him to lose trust in Metro. But, while I can understand that, the issue here is whether I think Metro made a mistake, or treated Mr T unfairly, such that it needs to now put things right.

I've carefully considered the response Metro provided to Mr T's complaint. It accepted that the service Mr T had received had fallen short of the standard it strives to deliver. I can see it apologised for the confusion and inconvenience Mr T experienced. And it's explained why this issue occurred – namely that the interest rate on Mr T's IAS account was showing incorrectly due to a known technical issue that was affecting these accounts on its online platforms. It explained that it was trying to remedy that issue and provided reassurance that the interest rate advertised when Mr T opened his IAS account would be honoured.

I acknowledge that it must have been worrying and frustrating for Mr T to see a different interest rate when logging onto his IAS account online and that this is bound to have caused confusion. But I'm satisfied overall Metro has acknowledged its error here and that it's now remedied the issue. So, the correct interest rate is showing when an account holder logs into the IAS account online. I'm persuaded that, as the error was a display issue only, Mr T will be credited interest at the correct rate.

I'm satisfied Metro's response to Mr T's complaint was provided without delay. I say this because Metro's final response was issued on 1 January 2024. So, Metro provided reassurance to Mr T about his concerns in a timely manner.

In Metro's final response letter, it didn't offer to compensate Mr T for what happened. But after Mr T referred his complaint to our service Metro has offered to pay him £75 compensation. For this reason, I'm upholding this complaint.

I understand that Mr T doesn't feel the compensation Metro's offered to pay is fair. So, I've carefully considered whether it's reasonable in the overall circumstances of what happened here.

I recognise that Mr T would like me to direct Metro to pay him £250 in compensation. But impartially, I think the compensation that Metro has offered to pay here takes into account the time he'd have spent seeking clarification of the interest rate and the worry he'd have been caused. The offer is in line with awards made by this service in comparable circumstances. I understand Mr T feels very strongly about the issues raised in his complaint and I'm not seeking to downplay the difficulties or frustrations he had here – far from it. But for the reasons already outlined, I'm satisfied the compensation Metro has offered to resolve this complaint fairly recognises the impact that what happened would have had on him.

### **Putting things right**

My final decision is that I'm upholding this complaint insofar as Metro should pay Mr T £75 in compensation to resolve this complaint. However, it need take no further action. This now brings to an end what we, in trying to resolve Mr T's dispute with Metro, can do for him.

**My final decision**

My final decision is that I uphold this complaint. Metro Bank Plc should pay Mr T £75 in compensation to resolve this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr T to accept or reject my decision before 28 October 2024.

Julie Mitchell  
**Ombudsman**