

The complaint

L, a limited company, complains that WorldPay (UK) Ltd recorded a marker about them on the Visa Merchant Screening Service (VMSS) system. They'd like an explanation of why this was, and appropriate compensation.

What happened

L opened a merchant services account with Worldpay in November 2024. Shortly after opening the account, L attempted a test transaction. This caused Worldpay to ask L to submit further information about the transaction and their intended use of the account. L declined, considering the information request to be excessive, and say they asked for the account to be closed.

However, after the account was closed L discovered Worldpay had added them to the VMSS system. In February 2025 L complained to Worldpay, believing they had also been added to the Mastercard MATCH system for high-risk businesses. They asked for the justification and reasoning for adding them to the list. They said this had led to their current merchant services agreement being terminated and being left unable to find another one. Worldpay responded in March 2025 to say that they had not been added to the MATCH system, but rather VMSS. But they said they would remove this marker.

Dissatisfied with this L referred their complaint to our service, saying they had not been provided a justification for adding the marker. At this point Worldpay offered £500 as a gesture of goodwill, but this was declined by L.

Our investigator thought the offer was fair. He reasoned that as L hadn't completed the review, it wasn't unreasonable for Worldpay to record a marker on VMSS. But it was reasonable for Worldpay to reconsider this once the complaint had been received. He felt the offer from Worldpay was reasonable for any service issues and didn't see that they needed to do anything further. L disagreed, and as such the complaint has now 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.

The above background to the complaint is only brief, which is in line with our service's role to act as an informal alternative to the courts. No discourtesy is intended by this to either party. And I'd like to assure them that I've read and considered all the arguments in relation to this complaint. If I don't mention something it's not because I've failed to take it on board or consider it carefully. But rather that I do not feel I need to in reaching a fair outcome.

Ultimately the events here begun with the test transaction that L attempted. This triggered a review by Worldpay, and the request for further information from L. It would have been sensible if this information was requested before agreeing to open the account, but Worldpay do have a right to request information of this kind. L obviously found this request

excessive and declined to provide the information. There are conflicting accounts of which party decided to close the account, but I don't think this makes any difference since both parties agree that they didn't want to continue the relationship. And considering there doesn't appear to have been any further attempts to use the account, I don't see that this had an impact on L.

Worldpay did add a report to the VMSS. I've not seen any evidence they added any information about L to MATCH, so I'm only going to consider the VMSS report. L has argued that Worldpay have not justified why this was – but Worldpay aren't under any specific obligation to explain why they did this to L. Here they've declined to provide further information, beyond that it was in line with their standard procedure. I don't see it would be reasonable to compel them to provide any further information to L. In any event they've now removed the report, which based on the circumstances of the complaint is more than reasonable.

There was a period where there was a listing with the VMSS, and L has said this led to their merchant services account with another provider being closed. I've not seen anything specifically about this, but this is certainly possible, and Worldpay hasn't disputed this. But in mitigation the loading was removed shortly after the complaint was raised. So, I see that any impact wouldn't be long-running or ongoing.

L has also highlighted problems with getting information from Worldpay, and the way they handled their data. They have referred some of these to the Information Commissioner's Office, rather than our service. But I've also taken account of these, although I note here that our complainant is L, the limited company. And limited companies – as is incorporated enterprises, that are legally distinct entities from the directors – don't have as extensive rights to information held about them as individuals do to their personal data.

Taking the problems caused by the VMSS listing, and the overall service provided by Worldpay, I find that the offer of £500 is more than reasonable for the impact of these failings. I see that this more than fairly covers any inconvenience to L, so I wouldn't look to increase it.

My final decision

My final decision is that WorldPay (UK) Ltd must pay L £500.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask L to accept or reject my decision before 5 January 2026.

Thom Bennett
Ombudsman