

The complaint

Mr S complains about the service he received from Lendable Ltd trading as Zable when trying to get a refund for transactions charged to his credit card.

What happened

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties, so I won't repeat it at length here. In summary, Mr S used his Zable credit card to make transactions for gambling in January 2025. Mr S says his account with the merchant was then restricted meaning he wasn't able to access these funds.

Having been unable to resolve the issue with the merchant, Mr S contacted Zable for help in getting a refund. Zable considered whether it could raise a chargeback, which is a process of asking the merchant for a refund, under rules set by the card scheme provider. Zable however said as the transactions related to gambling, it wasn't able to help.

Unhappy, Mr S complained. Following this, Zable raised a chargeback for both transactions, which were ultimately successful, meaning the funds were credited back to his account and the associated interest for these transactions was removed. To apologise for any inconvenience, Zable applied £55 credit to the balance of Mr S' credit card.

Mr S was unhappy Zable had credited the compensation to his credit card, saying he'd asked for this to be paid into his bank account. Mr S therefore referred his concerns to the Financial Ombudsman.

One of our Investigator's looked into what happened. He said the underlying matter had been resolved, as the chargebacks had been successful, however he didn't think the compensation Zable paid was fair. He said it was clear Mr S had asked for the compensation to be paid to his bank account, so recommended Zable do this, rather than applying it to his credit card account. He also recommended Zable pay a further £100 to recognise the inconvenience caused.

Zable responded to say Mr S had since closed his credit card, so it wasn't possible to remove the £55 credit from this and didn't think it was fair it paid this twice. Zable agreed to the recommendation of a further £100 compensation. Mr S said it was unfair Zable wouldn't pay the £55 to his current account, saying he'd had no benefit of the payment to his credit card.

As the matter wasn't resolved, the 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.

I've given consideration to the relevant rules and regulations applicable to this complaint and while I may not comment on everything (only what I consider is key) this is not meant as a discourtesy to either party, rather reflects the informal nature of our service.

My understanding is that the underlying issue has been resolved, in that the chargebacks for the transactions have been raised and were successful, meaning these funds were credited back to Mr S' credit card account. My decision therefore focuses on the service Zable provided and what fair compensation is.

I've started by reviewing Mr S' concerns that he had no benefit of the £55 credit Zable applied to his account. On this point, while I appreciate this answer will come as a disappointment to Mr S, I don't agree. The credit to his account, reduced the outstanding balance and Mr S confirmed he then didn't have to make a payment towards the outstanding balance in April 2025.

As the account has now been paid off and closed, Mr S had to pay off less than he would have, had Zable paid the compensation to his current account. So, I don't find it proportionate that Zable should then reopen Mr S' credit card, apply a £55 charge and then pay this as compensation to his current account. Simply put, Mr S would most likely then use this £55 to pay off the outstanding amount of his credit card balance. So, I won't be directing Zable to do anything further in relation to the £55 it's already paid.

Our Investigator recommended Zable pay Mr S a further £100 in recognition of the service it provided and in the circumstances I find this fair. It's clear Mr S was keen to try and resolve this matter, which was ongoing for a number of months and that it was a cause of serious concern for Mr S. Zable has recognised that the service it provided should have been better and I think a further £100 compensation fairly reflects this.

Therefore to resolve this complaint, I find Zable should pay Mr S a further £100 compensation.

My final decision

For the reasons I've explained above, I uphold this complaint and direct Lendable Ltd trading as Zable to pay Mr S a further £100 compensation.

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

Christopher Convery
Ombudsman