

The complaint

Mrs L is acting on behalf of a business L. I will refer to Mrs L throughout this decision.

Mrs L is unhappy with Barclays Bank UK PLC. Mrs L asked Barclays to recall a payment on her behalf and Barclays didn't get her money back.

What happened

Mrs L made a payment to another business F for work it carried out for her business. But F said it had updated its bank account details and Mrs L needed to recall the money and send payment to F through a different account. F said it no longer had access to the account and couldn't get the money Mrs L had sent that first time around.

Mrs L made the request to Barclays, and it started the process. Mrs L was reclaiming £4,000. Barclays attempted to get the money back but was unsuccessful. For some reason the incorrect amount was recalled by Barclays. It attempted to get back £800 rather than the £4,000 Mrs L had paid out and now wanted to reclaim. Instead, Barclays closed Mrs L's request for £4,000 and didn't notify her.

But Barclays did check with the beneficiary bank who confirmed the money was paid into an open and active account. It said because of this it was unable to raise a recall request. Barclays suggested this might be a civil matter Mrs L could take up with F.

Barclays accepted it raised the request incorrectly, then closed it and didn't raise a new correct one after that. It accepted it was slow to update Mrs L and caused delays. Barclays apologised for the poor service and offered Mrs L £150 for the errors and poor communication.

Mrs L didn't accept this and brought her complaint to this service.

Our investigator didn't uphold the complaint. He accepted the recall process is on a best endeavours basis and Barclays would never be able to guarantee that the funds would be returned. He noted the funds had been credited to the intended account, and this account was open and active. The beneficiary bank confirmed it wouldn't have been able to return the funds even if Barclays had got the original request right first time. He said the £150 offered as compensation was fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

Mrs L didn't accept this and asked for her 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.

Mrs L has pointed out that she has now paid twice for the same work. F contacted her after she had made payment through Barclays. F said it couldn't access the funds she had sent to

this old account. F told Mrs L she could reclaim those funds and asked if she could pay the £4,000 to its new bank account which she did.

Mrs L contacted Barclays immediately and the attempt to recall was made the day after the original payment was put through. Mrs L made regular attempts to find out what had happened and continued to ask Barclays if she was going to get her money back.

Mrs L feels she is entitled to her £4,000 back.

Barclays did write to Mrs L back in November 2023 confirming any attempt to reclaim was on the best endeavours basis and confirmed there were no guarantees. Despite accepting it made errors Barclays said even if it had set everything up correctly first time it would not have been able to recall the funds. It said using the Confirmation of Payee service the beneficiary account provided a positive match for F. It said this meant the funds were “out of scope” for a payment recall.

Barclays said *“the Credit Payment Recovery process is designed for when a customer makes a payment in error to an unintended beneficiary who cannot then deal directly, however as this payment was to an account the customer has paid before, and both our Confirmation of Payee, and the beneficiary bank confirming the account is still open and active in the name of the intended beneficiary, then this falls out of scope to be recalled through the scheme. The beneficiary should have been able to contact the beneficiary bank to request the funds.”*

Barclays confirmed this meant the *“recall would have failed / rejected in all eventualities”* So, Barclays said despite errors it had followed the Credit Payment Recovery Framework correctly and the beneficiary bank had provided a valid rejection reason. I think that's fair and reasonable. Barclays actions here are in line with standard banking processes.

I note our investigator contacted the beneficiary bank too in an attempt to investigate the matter as widely as possible. The beneficiary bank said even if Barclays had correctly sent through the Credit Payment Recovery request it wouldn't have been able to reclaim the money from F's account. It confirmed F's account was open, active and had no restrictions in place at that time.

I've highlighted above the mistakes made by Barclays when it attempted to recall the money. It accepted that mistakes were made, it apologised and offered £150 as compensation for any distress and inconvenience caused. In the circumstances I think that's fair and reasonable outcome. If it hasn't already done so it should arrange to pay Mrs L the £150 compensation immediately.

My final decision

I don't uphold this complaint.

I make no further award against Barclays Bank UK PLC.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask L to accept or reject my decision before 8 August 2025.

John Quinlan
Ombudsman