

## The complaint

Mr I complains that IG Trading and Investments Limited (IG) unfairly rejected three trades placed on its investment platform.

## What happened

In November 2023, Mr I attempted to invest approximately £61,000 in an exchange traded fund (ETF) via IG's mobile app for its investment platform.

He initially placed an order for 162 shares in the ETF, which was immediately rejected. Mr I said he didn't understand why the order was rejected and tried again, this time adjusting the order amount to 133 shares. This second order was also rejected. Mr I tried a third and final attempt to place the order, this time reducing the amount to 100 shares, which also failed. He said he received no explanation for why IG refused to execute the trades.

At the time of placing the first order, the price was £375.70 per share, which was the maximum Mr I said he was willing to pay. He told us the share price has been higher ever since, meaning he's missed out on the opportunity to invest in the fund and benefit from investment returns.

Mr I complained to IG for not executing the trades in line with his instruction and failing to explain why. Amongst other points that have been outlined above, he said:

- IG breached its terms of agreement by failing to provide sufficient explanation for why the orders were rejected.
- IG's actions caused him to miss out on gains amounting to approximately £20,000 in the year since.
- The situation left him feeling manipulated, stressed, embarrassed and unintelligent.

IG didn't uphold Mr I's complaint. It said the account has a maximum consideration limit of £25,000 per trade. All three of Mr I's attempted trades were for amounts in excess of this threshold, which is why they were automatically rejected. IG explained its platform is designed to display the rejection reason on the deal ticket.

Mr I didn't accept IG's response. He said the £25,000 limit wasn't set out within the account terms and he wasn't given information to explain what "*maximum consideration*" meant. He felt IG had breached its obligation to provide clear information to retail customers.

One of our investigators looked into Mr I's complaint and didn't think IG needed to take any action. They said:

- On balance, they were satisfied IG complied with the account terms and provided appropriate information to explain why the orders were rejected.
- Mr I's actions demonstrated he likely understood his order exceeded the threshold, as his subsequent orders were adjusted to smaller amounts. But these actions indicated he likely wasn't fully aware of the exact order limit.

- Mr I had an execution only account, which puts the onus on him to monitor it and take action to resolve any issues. There's no evidence to indicate Mr I contacted IG at the relevant time to resolve his problem with the trade.
- Mr I ought to have followed up with IG to seek clarification. Had he done this, it's likely IG would've explained the threshold or offered guidance on an alternative method to complete the order. He may have also been able to find the answer by reviewing help pages on IG's website.

Mr I didn't agree with the investigator's view. He said:

- He's seen no evidence to demonstrate he was informed why the orders were rejected.
- His attempts to adjust the order amount weren't in response to any information provided by IG.
- Having an execution only account doesn't absolve IG from its communication obligations.

As matters remain unresolved, Mr I's complaint has been passed to me to decide.

### **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.

It does not appear to be in dispute that IG is entitled under the terms of the account to reject order instructions on certain occasions. IG has pointed to section six of the terms, which state:

*“(1) We may, acting reasonably, refuse to accept an Instruction to Deal where:  
[...]  
(c) you have exceeded any limit applicable to you or in respect of your dealings with us;”*

IG explained the relevant order limit for Mr I's account was £25,000, which is not specified in the terms of agreement. Mr I has said IG's failure to make the order limit clear within the account terms breaches its obligation to protect retail customers.

I can understand why IG's decision not to specify the order limit within the terms may cause some confusion, as I think Mr I has experienced. But I don't think IG has acted unreasonably by choosing not to specify the limit within the agreement.

IG explained in its final response letter, there are circumstances where the order limit could be exceeded – by changing the order type, or restructuring commission on the account. I also think it's possible IG could make a commercial decision to change the order limit from time to time making it impractical to specify the threshold within the account terms.

So, while I don't think IG has acted unfairly by not specifying the order limit within the terms of agreement, I do think it's good practice for IG to have disclosed the limit elsewhere. I note IG provides educational materials within the help section of its website. This includes details of the usual order limits that apply to share dealing, which are relatively easy to locate. I'm satisfied IG has done enough here to meet regulatory expectations to provide information that is clear, fair and not misleading to enable Mr I to make informed decisions with his investments.

## Was information provided to explain why the trades were rejected?

The key issue in dispute here is whether Mr I was notified of the reason why the trades were rejected. He's referenced the following term from the agreement, which he doesn't agree IG complied with:

**“6. [...]**  
*(2) Unless Applicable Regulations prevent us from doing so, we will use our reasonable efforts to tell you our reason for refusing to act on an Instruction to Deal and what you can do to correct that Instruction to Deal.”*

IG said its platform is designed to display the reason for rejecting a trade within the deal ticket. It provided a screenshot from its internal system indicating Mr I's initial order resulted in “*Max Consideration Failure*”, but this doesn't clearly demonstrate what Mr I would've seen within the mobile app. IG told us it's unable to reproduce a screenshot to show how the rejection information would look within the app.

Mr I told us he was aware immediately after placing the initial order that it had been rejected. While he asserts he wasn't given an explanation, his subsequent actions indicate awareness the reason may have been due to breaching an order limit threshold, as his second and third orders were for increasingly reduced amounts. This trial and error approach suggests Mr I wasn't aware the order limit was £25,000, but I don't think the account terms require this to be specified in any notification shown on the platform.

In my view, Mr I's decision to adjust his subsequent orders for smaller amounts suggests he likely understood the rejection was due to breaching an order limit and the method to correct this was reducing the size of the order. Having weighed up the available evidence, I think it's more likely than not Mr I's decision to reduce the size of his subsequent attempted trades was in response to information displayed on the deal ticket indicating the previous order was rejected due to breaching the maximum consideration threshold. It's unfortunate Mr I's subsequent attempts were still above the threshold.

## Loss mitigation

Regardless of whether IG provided notice of the rejection reason to Mr I – which as I've set out above, I think it likely did – it's important I consider whether the circumstances presented an opportunity for Mr I to reasonably mitigate his position. Ultimately, I think Mr I ought to have taken action to clarify his understanding of the order limit, which I'm satisfied would've enabled him to invest in the ETF as planned.

In my view, Mr I's decision to adjust the order amounts indicates he understood the reason his initial order was rejected was connected to its size, rather than some other reason, such as a system glitch or outage.

Mr I had an execution-only agreement with IG, which means he was responsible for managing his investments within the account. I think Mr I ought to have familiarised himself with how the account worked, including verifying any applicable limits. As noted earlier in this decision, IG provided educational materials on its website, which included details of the £25,000 threshold. As Mr I was planning to trade a relatively large amount, I think it would've been reasonable for him to have checked the applicable limit prior to placing the trade – or at the point the first trade failed to determine a workaround.

Alternatively, Mr I could've contacted IG's helpdesk for guidance. Had he done so, I'm satisfied IG would've been able to clarify the order limit amount and suggest alternative

methods for making his investment – for example by placing multiple smaller orders each with a value under the £25,000 threshold.

I haven't seen any evidence to suggest Mr I contacted IG, or attempted to mitigate his position by investing the funds elsewhere.

I think Mr I had a reasonable opportunity to mitigate his loss by researching the order limit, or contacting IG for clarification. While I understand this answer will be disappointing for him – for the reasons I've given, I'm not asking IG to take any action.

### **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 I to accept or reject my decision before 12 January 2026.

Rebecca Faiers  
**Ombudsman**