

The complaint

Mr O complains that Wise Payments Limited closed his account without notice and that it has not properly accounted for the funds held at the time of closure.

What happened

In July 2024 Mr O contacted Wise to query a payment which had been made from his account. He said that he had not made or authorised the payment, which had been made following a call from someone claiming to be from Wise's fraud department. Wise investigated but did not agree to make a refund. It noted that the payment had been made after an authorisation code had been sent to Mr O.

Wise wrote to Mr O on 2 August 2024 with the results of its investigation. It then told him that it would be deactivating his account with immediate effect. Mr O's funds were split into four "jars": a main account; a savings account; a shares account; and a Euro account. Most of the funds in those accounts were returned to Mr O within a couple of weeks, but because of an error on the part of Wise, £54.64 remained unpaid until 31 October 2024. Wise offered to pay Mr O interest on that sum at 8% from the date on which it should have been paid, together with a further £25. Mr O did not accept that offer.

Mr O referred the matter to this service. One of our investigators considered what had happened but did not recommend that the complaint be upheld. She concluded, in summary, that Wise had been within its rights to close the account and that it had provided sufficient information to Mr O about the movements on it. She thought that Wise's offer was reasonable in the circumstances.

Mr O did not accept the investigator's assessment and asked that an ombudsman review the case. In doing so, he said that Wise's actions had caused a direct debit payment to be returned, which in turn had affected his credit rating.

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.

Having done so, however, I've reached broadly the same conclusions as the investigator did, and for similar reasons.

It is generally for financial service providers, as a matter of their own commercial judgment, to decide whether to provide or to continue to provide services to any particular customer. As long as that judgment is exercised legitimately, this service won't usually intervene. I am satisfied that Wise was within its rights to exercise its discretion in closing Mr O's account.

We do however expect financial businesses to give reasonable notice before closing an account. What is reasonable depends on the circumstances, but in some cases it may be appropriate to close an account with immediate effect. I think it was reasonable of Wise to do so here.

Mr O asked Wise to provide him with a full list of payees linked to his account. Wise noted that there might be payees listed who had never in fact received any payments. But it provided Mr O with copy statements which showed the people to whom he made payments. I believe that was sufficient to meet its obligations to him.

Mr O says that the funds released to him do not properly represent funds in his account. He says he has received about £200 less than he was owed. He has however provided no evidence to support that assertion; nor has identified any error in the account statements.

Mr O says that he is due a dividend payment on his stocks jar. Wise has however explained that funds held in that jar were invested in a tracker fund and that no dividends were due. I am satisfied that is the case.

Finally, Mr O says that a direct debit payment was missed because of Wise's actions. Since I am satisfied that Wise acted fairly, I do not need to comment on that. I do note however that Mr O has provided no evidence in support of that and that he has previously said that his Wise account was his main account; there were no direct debits on that account, however.

In the circumstances, I believe that Wise's offer was a reasonable one and I simply leave it to Mr O to decide whether he wishes to accept it.

My final decision

For these reasons, my final decision is that I do not uphold Mr O's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr O to accept or reject my decision before 28 August 2025.

Mike Ingram

Ombudsman