

The complaint

Mr S complains that Odey Wealth Management (UK) Limited (“OWM”) caused him a loss due to a trade error within a fund in which he’d invested.

What happened

Mr S was invested in a fund I’ll call A. The fund was managed by a sister firm of OWM, which I’ll call B. Mr S’s investment was held through OWM.

In 2024, Mr S raised a complaint with B. He said that in 2019, the fund’s traders had failed to correctly hedge currency exposure relating to a stock held within the fund. He said it had cost the fund, and consequently him as an investor, money. He wanted the fund (or the fund manager, B) to reimburse him.

B told Mr S he didn’t have a relationship with it – it simply managed a fund he was invested in. It explained the investment was held with OWM. It didn’t uphold his complaint.

Mr S brought his complaint about B to our service (which has been dealt with as a separate complaint). He also brought the same complaint about the losses resulting from the alleged hedging failure, but against OWM. He said he was unsure which was the correct entity to complain about and wanted our service to decide.

One of our investigators looked into things but didn’t think Mr S’s complaint about OWM should be upheld. She didn’t think any errors in the management or trading within the fund would be something OWM could be held responsible for. So she didn’t think it would be fair to require OWM to pay Mr S any compensation.

Mr S asked for an ombudsman’s decision *“just to be sure”* and so the matter has been passed to me.

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 I’ve reached the same conclusions as our investigator and for broadly the same reasons.

Firstly, to be clear this complaint only relates to Mr S and his relationship with OWM. It doesn’t concern any issues Mr S has with B.

I also make no finding about the specific allegations Mr S has made about the currency hedging in the fund and whether this is something the fund ought to have put right. I’m not considering that for the same reasons as the investigator – because I don’t think they’re anything to do with OWM or its role and the responsibilities it had towards Mr S.

OWM was a related entity to B, but a separate one. OWM effectively provided an account through which Mr S could hold investments, including his holding in A. So this meant it

needed to have regard for Mr S's interests and treat him fairly, execute orders in line with its regulatory obligations, and look after Mr S's assets in line with the regulator's rules – amongst other legal and regulatory duties it owed him.

But I'm not aware that OWM's role extended to any responsibility for the operation and decision making within or by the fund of A itself. Those decisions were rightly for either the body corporate of A or for B as the designated investment manager. And Mr S's complaint relates to those kind of decisions – the error he alleges was one made by employees of the fund, and the rectification of that error (or, as Mr S says, the lack of any such rectification) could also only be carried out by A or B. I can't see that OWM could fairly be held responsible for the consequences of any of those decisions, as it wasn't party to them or able to influence them.

It follows that I can't uphold Mr S's complaint about OWM, although I appreciate this will come as a disappointment to him.

My final decision

For the reasons I've given I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr S to accept or reject my decision before 25 September 2025.

Luke Gordon
Ombudsman