

## **The complaint**

Mr D is unhappy the contactless feature on his card wasn't working and when he told PSI-Pay (Pockit) this, they cancelled his card without telling him.

## **What happened**

The facts of this complaint are well known to both sides, so I've summarised them below.

On 31 August 2024 Mr D let Pockit know via its in-app chat that he wasn't able to make contactless payments. The Pockit advisor asked Mr D to provide a screenshot of any error he was getting when trying to make a contactless payment. Mr D explained that it didn't even register the contactless element so there was no error message.

On 2 September 2024 the Pockit advisor asked Mr D to confirm his full address so that they could look into sending him a replacement card. Mr D provided his address and Pockit issued the replacement card.

Mr D complained later that day as his old card wasn't working. Pockit informed him the old card would have been cancelled when the replacement one was sent. Mr D was unhappy he wasn't told this and said if he was, he would have asked Pockit not to send the replacement.

Pockit didn't uphold Mr D's complaint as they were satisfied they acted correctly in sending Mr D a new card. Pockit apologised they didn't mention his old card would be cancelled and activated Mr D's new card immediately so he could use it virtually. They explained he would be able to make transactions using the virtual card, including ATM withdrawals and informed him of his nearest shop that would support this. They also advised Mr D that any money due into his account would automatically credit the new card.

Mr D referred his complaint to our service. He remained unhappy that he didn't request a new card and Pockit just went ahead and did this without telling him his old card would stop working. He says his dyslexia prevents him from understanding all written correspondence – something he's told Pockit previously - and by just providing his address he didn't think a new card would be sent. Mr D has explained he has mobility issues, and Pockit's actions have caused him stress and anxiety.

Our investigator didn't uphold Mr D's complaint. She was satisfied that by giving his address to Pockit when asked, he'd consented to a new card being sent. She acknowledged that Pockit didn't tell Mr D his old card would be cancelled, but was satisfied they had taken steps quickly to rectify this by activating his new card so he could use it virtually. The investigator pointed out that Mr D had £0.14 in his account on 2 September 2024 so was satisfied he wasn't deprived the use of his funds.

Mr D disagreed. He said it's not right that Pockit say he asked for a new card because he didn't. He explained that using the virtual card to withdraw money was more difficult as the staff in the shops were reluctant to let him do it.

Because Mr D disagreed, 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'll start by explaining that I have taken Mr D's personal circumstances into consideration and I don't take what he's told us lightly. I appreciate he is very upset and frustrated by Pockit's actions. However, I'm not in a position to uphold the complaint. I will explain why.

Mr D has said the contactless feature on his card wasn't working which I appreciate would have been frustrating. But given he was still able to use the chip and PIN element of his card, I don't think this caused a significant detriment. But the crux of this complaint is what Pockit did when Mr D told them about his difficulties with the contactless feature not working.

I don't think Mr D explicitly asked for a new card to be sent when raising the issue of his contactless not working. Pockit has also said it's aware Mr D is dyslexic and has expressed he would prefer telephone contact as he doesn't always understand what is written. So, I appreciate Mr D may not have realised giving his address to the Pockit advisor meant a card would be sent there and then.

However, I don't think it was unreasonable Pockit sent him a new card given the issues he was experiencing and his dissatisfaction around this. I'm satisfied Pockit was trying to help and resolve the problem for Mr D as quickly as possible. I think the main issue stems from Mr D not being aware that in being sent a new card, his old one would be cancelled.

Having reviewed the in-app chat messages, I can see Pockit didn't tell Mr D that his old card would be cancelled prior to his new one arriving. Whilst this may be normal banking practice, this isn't something I would expect all consumers to be aware of, so it would have been good to see Pockit let Mr D know. I can see from the in-app chat Pockit did apologise this wasn't mentioned to him.

As a service, our role isn't to punish a financial business for an error they've made. Instead, we look at the impact of any errors. We may award compensation to a consumer if they have suffered more than a minor inconvenience for example.

Having reviewed what happened after Mr D's old card was cancelled, I'm satisfied Pockit took appropriate action to rectify the situation and did so immediately. As soon as Mr D made Pockit aware of his dissatisfaction around the fact his old card had stopped working, Pockit took steps to ensure Mr D could use his new card straight away by activating it virtually. This meant he could make all his regular transactions without needing the physical card. Mr D had £0.14 in his account on 2 September 2024, so I don't think in the short time that day between his old card being cancelled and his new one being activated, Mr D was prevented from accessing money in his account.

Mr D says he was alerted to the fact his card had been blocked as someone was trying to pay money in, but again, this was rectified quickly when the new card was activated. So, if someone was trying to pay money in that day, this could have been done. As it was, money wasn't paid into the account until 4 September 2024. And I can see from that point on Mr D didn't have any problem accessing his money.

I understand Mr D says withdrawing money using the virtual card wasn't as easy as using a regular ATM as the staff in the shop made it difficult for him, but I'm ultimately satisfied he was able to get money in this way, and I wouldn't look to hold Pockit responsible for the shop

keepers' actions. I also note that in making withdrawals in this way Mr D was subject to a lower withdrawal fee than if he'd used his physical card. So, there is no loss here.

Given this, whilst I accept Pockit should have told Mr D his old card would be cancelled when issuing a new one, Pockit took immediate steps to ensure Mr D wasn't disadvantaged and did apologise he wasn't told this prior to it happening. And I'm satisfied from what I've seen, Mr D wasn't prevented from using his account whilst he waited for the physical card to arrive. I therefore think any distress or inconvenience caused was minimal and I won't be asking Pockit to take any further action.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I don't uphold Mr D's complaint against PSI-Pay.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr D to accept or reject my decision before 5 November 2025.

Sarah Brimacombe  
**Ombudsman**