

The complaint

Ms M complains that Shop Direct Finance Company Limited, trading as Littlewoods, didn't close her account with it, has dealt with her using multiple reference numbers and has given her contradictory information.

What happened

Ms M had a shopping account with Shop Direct Finance which was inactive from February 2022. She contacted Shop Direct Finance about the account in March 2025 and it was closed and the credit agreement was terminated. Ms M made a data subject access request to Shop Direct Finance and complained to it about how it had dealt with her account. It said that the account was showing as dormant rather than active, but wasn't showing as settled because the account hadn't been closed correctly. It apologised for that and said that it had closed the account correctly and requested for Ms M's credit file to be updated.

Ms M wasn't satisfied with its response so referred her complaint to this service. She said that, to put things right, she was asking for: a full written explanation of how her complaint was managed and why so many reference numbers were issued; confirmation that her personal documents and data have been properly processed and secured; an acknowledgment of the stress and inconvenience caused; and a compensation payment of £400. Shop Direct Finance offered to pay Ms M £30 as a gesture of goodwill for the inconvenience caused, and then offered to increase the offer to £50.

Ms M didn't accept those offers, so her complaint was looked at by one of this service's investigators who, having considered everything, didn't recommend that it should be upheld. He said that, although the account was left open, there was no financial impact and it didn't negatively affect Ms M's credit file. He said that the account was closed in March 2025 and he hadn't seen evidence to suggest that Ms M contacted Shop Direct Finance multiple times to close her account. He felt that Shop Direct Finance's offer and apology were fair given the circumstances.

Ms M hasn't accepted the investigator's recommendation and has requested that her complaint be referred to an ombudsman for a decision. She has described her key points of disagreement about: the prolonged account status on her credit file; the contradicting information and mishandling of her case; the impact on time, effort, and stress; and the failure to acknowledge accountability. She says that she requested £400 as a fair and proportionate amount given the scale of time, effort, inconvenience, and distress caused to her by Shop Direct Finance's failings.

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.

Ms M has described in detail her issues with the way that Shop Direct Finance has dealt with her account. Shop Direct Finance says that the account was opened in October 2017 and Ms M entered into a credit agreement. It says that its records show that Ms M contacted it in

March 2025 about the delay in closing her account, but it hadn't received a request to close the account. The account had been dormant since February 2022, but hadn't been closed and the credit agreement hadn't been terminated. In response to Ms M's request to do so, the account was then closed and the credit agreement was terminated in May 2025 and Shop Direct Finance says that it can't identify any failing by it.

I'm not persuaded that there's enough evidence to show that Ms M asked Shop Direct Finance to close her account before March 2025. Nor am I persuaded that there's enough evidence to show that Shop Direct Finance has reported any information about Ms M's account to the credit reference agencies that isn't true and accurate. Even if I'm wrong about that, Shop Direct Finance said in its final response letter to Ms M that it requested for her credit file to be updated and I've seen no evidence to show that she's been caused any financial loss because of the information on her credit file or that the integrity of her credit file has been undermined.

Shop Direct Finance says that Ms M had requested all information recorded and communications about her account, so a data subject access request was logged along with her credit file complaint. It says that the complaint was escalated to its data protection team, but it was closed as logged incorrectly and a further complaint was logged, but was closed as Ms M failed identification and verification. It says that another complaint was logged and a final response was issued to Ms M to inform her that it was unable to erase the account details. Shop Direct Finance says that the personal information and data supplied by Ms M have been securely processed and attached to her account securely. I'm not persuaded that there's enough evidence to show that Shop Direct Finance has dealt with Ms M's data subject access request incorrectly, but if she has concerns about that, I suggest that she contacts the Information Commissioner's Office.

I've carefully considered all that Ms M has said and provided about her complaint, including her description of the significant time and energy that she invested in monitoring her credit file, submitting disputes, chasing updates, and managing contradictory responses and her requested for £400 compensation given the scale of the time, effort, inconvenience, and distress caused to her by Shop Direct Finance's failings. I appreciate that my decision will be disappointing for Ms M, but I consider that the apology that Shop Direct Finance has made to Ms M and its offer to pay her £50 as a gesture of goodwill for the inconvenience caused were fair and reasonable in the circumstances. I don't consider that compensation of £400 is justified in these circumstances and I find that it wouldn't be fair or reasonable for me to require Shop Direct Finance to pay any compensation to Ms M or to take any other action in response to her complaint. Ms M didn't accept Shop Direct Finance's offers of compensation, but if she now wants to accept its offer of £50 compensation, I suggest that she contacts Shop Direct Finance about it.

My final decision

My decision is that I don't uphold Ms M's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Ms M to accept or reject my decision before 24 December 2025.

Jarrold Hastings
Ombudsman