

The complaint

Mr W complains that TSB Bank plc (TSB) is unable to issue correct statements showing a missing transaction.

What happened

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties, so I won't repeat everything here. In summary Mr W is unhappy with a discrepancy in his bank statements.

Specifically, he says that the closing balance of one of his statements is £250 less than the opening statement of his next statement.

TSB has explained that the missing £250 is due to a cash withdrawal. While they are not certain why this transaction is missing from his statements, they said that this was likely due to the timing of the transaction and an "IT/System error at their end". They have apologised for this and provided Mr W with a mini statement which showed this missing transaction. They have also offered him £50 to by way of apology and to compensate him for the trouble and upset this discrepancy caused.

Mr W was willing to accept the £50 compensation on the condition that TSB provide him with new statements showing the missing transaction to satisfy HMRC. Mr W doesn't think a mini statement is sufficient and references his previous experience with HMRC. He believes that new statements showing the missing transaction (on headed paper) would be needed to satisfy HMRC requirements.

TSB has said providing new updated statements isn't possible, as if they recreate the statements they still wouldn't show the missing transaction. They said that in similar cases they have been able to issue mini statements. As this is on headed paper and has the customer details, this alongside their final response letter to where they explain the error, should be sufficient for Mr W (and any possible dealings he may have with HMRC about this).

The investigator concluded that TSB had acted fairly, and while the reissuing of the statements showing the missing transaction would be ideal here, felt that TSB had provided a suitable workaround.

Mr W disagrees and says that HMRC are incredibly inflexible. He said it previously took ten letters back and forth to resolve a previous enquiry they had about his tax return. He has quoted emails between him and HMRC from November 2023 where they requested "full unredacted bank statements". And confirmed that "mini- statements are not acceptable". They requested full unredacted bank statements for the tax year in question". Mr W explained that as five days were missing from the statements (the last five days of the financial year, where Mr W says he didn't complete any transactions) he needed to give HMRC permission to contact the bank on his behalf and request any information they thought necessary.

Mr W has also referenced previous IT issues that TSB has had. As an agreement wasn't reached this complaint has been passed to me for a 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.

While I might not comment on everything (only what I consider key) this is not meant as a discourtesy to either party – it reflects my role resolving disputes with minimum formality. I'd like to assure both parties I've considered everything they have sent.

I've reviewed the statements and can see that statement 349 says that the balance on 17 June 2024 is £19,330.42 and that statement 350 says that the balance on 18 June 2024 is £19,080.42, a difference of £250. I can also see that the missing transaction is showing on the mini statement as a cash withdrawal and that this transaction isn't showing on statement 349 or 350. I think it's fair to say Mr W has been inconvenienced because of this as he needed to contact TSB to get to the bottom of this discrepancy. So I do think compensation is warranted here. In deciding if the £50 offered by TSB is fair I've taken into account our service's approach to compensation and the fact that our role isn't to punish or regulate businesses. Instead, where we find that a business has acted unfairly our role is to put the consumer back in the position they would have been in had the error not occurred.

Mr W has referenced previous IT issues with TSB, and in his response to the investigator's view says that he was "hoping that the Ombudsman, as an expert in this area, would be able to give a firm opinion as to whether TSB's systems are malfunctioning. Am I the first person that this has happened to? Or are there other similar cases that you have investigated?"

While I understand Mr W wanting to know further details about other complaints we have with TSB, I'm limited to only commenting on the specifics of his case and cannot comment on other cases we may have had with TSB. Our role isn't to monitor TSB or its IT systems but to instead look into individual complaints about TSB and determine if they have acted fairly. If they haven't, we recommend the steps they should take to put the consumer back in the position they would have been in had the error not occurred. I am reviewing this case independently, on its own specific facts in order to determine if TSB needs to do more.

Mr W has also referenced other issues that he has had with TSB's IT systems but these issues are outside the scope of this complaint – however I have noted Mr W's point that he has found TSB's systems to be poor in the past.

Given Mr W's past experience with HMRC I understand why he is insisting on full statements as opposed to a mini statement. However, TSB confirmed they are unable to produce this, and I've not seen anything that persuades me that TSB's systems aren't limited in this way. When TSB were unable to provide full statements before, Mr W provided HMRC with permission to contact TSB directly (what has been referred to as a "mandate" in the information Mr R has provided). And such a workaround may be needed again here if HMRC doesn't accept the mini statement.

The incorrect statements were from June/July 2024. TSB responded to Mr W's complaint in September – and provided him with a mini statement showing the missing transaction. In January 2025 following Mr W bringing the complaint to our service they offered him £50 to compensate him for the trouble and upset the error in his statements caused him.

Considering how long this has gone on for and the additional steps Mr W has had to take, alongside the impact that this had on Mr W, I'm satisfied that the £50 offered by TSB is fair here and in line with our approach.

My final decision

For the reasons set out above, my final decision is that TSB Bank plc pay Mr W £50.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr W to accept or reject my decision before 7 October 2025.

Sureeni Weerasinghe
Ombudsman