

The complaint

Mr C has complained that Lloyds Bank PLC didn't give him accurate information about his credit balance.

What happened

On 5 June 2025, Mr C made two payments to a third party merchant. However, a payment of £191.82 wasn't debited from his account until 9 June 2025. By this time, Mr C had transferred out a further £170 on 7 June – meaning that when the £191.82 was debited, his account entered an unauthorised overdraft. He's explained that it had not shown as being 'pending', so he thought he had more funds available to him than he did.

One of our investigators looked into what had happened. As part of this, Lloyds provided a transaction report. This showed that on 5 June there were two transactions with the third party. One of those was for £206.82 and the other for £18. The third party requested the payment of £18 and another for £15 from Lloyds on 7 June. Lloyds says this looked to have removed the pending authority for the total amount. The remaining £191.82 was requested on 8 June 2025 and debited on 9 June. Our investigator said that the third party may be able to shed light on why the funds were requested in this way, but he didn't think Lloyds was at fault. He said although it would be unusual if the pending marker was removed due to this, it was important to note that the £191.82 payment hadn't been taken on 7 June, and Mr C would have been able to see this by looking at his cleared transactions.

Mr C disagreed. He said that the erroneous removal of the 'pending' marker in Lloyds' systems directly caused the issue he is now facing. He trusted the balance displayed, and if the pending marker was not visible, there was no way for him to know that those funds were still reserved.

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, and despite my considerable sympathy for Mr C's position, I'm not upholding it. I agree that a customer should typically be able to rely on transactions that haven't left the account to be shown as 'pending'. This did not happen here, which meant that the available balance was incorrect.

However, this appears to have come about due to a very unusual set of circumstances, by which Mr C made two transactions, and the third party requested two sums. This seems to have had the effect of not showing there to be anything further pending. I think this is very unusual, such that Lloyds couldn't reasonably have been able to predict its occurrence. That said, I do now wonder if it's able to build something into its systems, to take into account such eventualities.

I think it's also the case that the sum wasn't insignificant, so Mr C may have been prudent to check his cleared transactions. Although, I also agree he should typically have been able to

rely on what was (or was not) showing as pending.

Although I have sympathy for Mr C's position, I don't think it was caused by something Lloyds could fairly have predicted.

My final decision

For the reasons given above, it's my final decision not to uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr C to accept or reject my decision before 16 February 2026.

Elspeth Wood
Ombudsman