

## **The complaint**

Mr C is bringing a complaint on behalf of a Limited company "S". I'll refer to Mr C throughout for ease.

Mr C is unhappy with Barclays Bank UK Plc. He feels the requirements it has put in place to update S's bank account mandate has left S in an impossible position.

## **What happened**

Mr C sent in a mandate change form in July 2024. But Barclays responded and said the changes require the approval of two signatories. Mr C said only one of the authorised signatories still with S is registered with Companies House as a Director. Mr C said he was the only other remaining authorised signatory, but he isn't a director or company secretary. This means he isn't shown on the records at Companies House. Mr C said in previous instances he had been able to sign. Barclays was unwilling to change the arrangements, so Mr C brought a complaint to this service on behalf of S.

Our investigator didn't uphold the complaint. He accepted Barclays point that its processes need to be followed. Barclays require active registered directors or company secretaries as noted with Companies House to authorise changes to the mandate for the company bank account. He noted Barclays had pointed out the second signatory didn't need to be an authorised account signatory. Our investigator said Barclays process was clear. He said there was a notification for anyone completing the forms online confirming this. Our investigator concluded Barclays had acted fairly and reasonably here.

Mr C on behalf of S didn't accept this and asked for the complaint to be passed to an ombudsman for a final 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.

Mr C feels he's done enough to expect Barclays to update the mandate for S's bank account. He had no problems getting this updated in the past and feels insulted that Barclays is unwilling to accept his signature to allow the update to go through.

Mr C would also like Barclays to reimburse him for the time and effort he's had to use trying to get the matter resolved. There's been postage costs and phone calls which wouldn't have been needed if Barclays had accepted the mandate.

Mr C said apart from the other director (an existing authorised signatory) that had signed the mandate he was the only other remaining authorised signatory so Barclays should be willing to accept his signature.

Mr C said the process for completing the forms was difficult and could be streamlined to take much less time.

Mr C pointed out due to the delays in getting this actioned the new chief executive was having to use their own personal accounts to make purchases for S and then reclaim the expense. He said the chief executive should be allowed to do this through the S account.

Previously S had four signatories but more recently had undergone changes in personnel and the account needed to be updated.

Barclays said the Companies House records showed more than one director registered but only one had signed the updated mandate requesting the changes. It said from the start Mr C isn't registered with Companies House, so S needed to obtain another registered name and get them to sign and return the mandate. It said along with that it would require a Personal Details Form for the other person signing.

Barclays confirmed that until this was done *"all current Online banking, Telephone banking and Debit card access will remain unchanged."*

Barclays said once the mandate change request had been updated it would conduct additional checks to ensure the records at Companies House matched. If there was a problem, then it would contact S again.

Barclays said it hadn't made any errors in the way it had processed this mandate request.

Barclays accepted that Mr C had pointed out difficulties completing the form online. But said he declined the offer of help at that stage. Instead, Mr C wrote to Barclays detailing the issues trying to create the mandate online. It responded offering support from its mandate team in creating a form to meet the business needs.

Barclays said Mr C did make contact and it helped with the online form on 2 July 2024. This was processed by the mandate team on 11 July 2024. After this it pointed out the requirements that still needed to be concluded. This stated the form needed two directors and confirmed while building the forms online Mr C would have seen a prompt noting this requirement.

Barclays when asked again confirmed the second director signing the mandate doesn't need to be an authorised signatory on S's bank account. Barclays listed all the people noted as active Directors according to Companies House who it said might be able to complete the mandate. Our investigator explained this point to Mr C. Mr C made a slightly different point at this stage He said Barclays had changed the procedure without notification and that the form was misleading.

Barclays maintain that it asks for a signature from one authorised signatory and then another active director in relation to the change mandate.

I think the requirements from Barclays are clear. I don't think these requirements are unreasonable or unfair.

Even if these are different arrangements from what Barclays allowed previously that doesn't mean it can't update the requirements. And it has shown evidence of a clear prompt in the online records to show what it needs for the change mandate to be accepted.

I can understand how this has been upsetting and frustrating for Mr C, but Barclays was clear that S doesn't have to add another authorised signatory. It just needs another director to sign the change mandate and provide the form with it to allow the change to go through. I think that's reasonable.

I get that Mr C feels insulted by this as he does so much of the work on behalf of B. But I don't think Barclays was trying to insult him. It has a process, and the requirements need to be followed.

I also understand Mr C's point about the time and effort taken. But I can't say that Barclays wasn't clear or that it didn't offer support to get the mandate done correctly. I accept that it hasn't made any errors here. I think Barclays acted fairly and reasonably.

### **My final decision**

I don't uphold this complaint.

I make no award against Barclays Bank UK Plc.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask S to accept or reject my decision before 11 March 2025.

John Quinlan  
**Ombudsman**