

The complaint

The estate of Mr H complains that Barclays Bank UK PLC (“Barclays”) provided misinformation regarding where Barclays Asset Management Limited (“BAM”) operate from.

What happened

In August 2023, the estate contacted BAM to transfer an investment to another bank. The estate was unhappy with the information it had provided and felt it was responsible for the delay of the transfer and ultimately, it losing its investment status. Our service previously considered a complaint against BAM regarding this. In the process of dealing with this previous complaint, the estate contacted Barclays and received a final response letter from it dated 4 September 2024. In this letter, Barclays explained that it couldn’t consider the estate’s concerns as they had already been dealt with by BAM in the previous complaint. However, Barclays also answered a query from the estate regarding where BAM operates. The estate was unhappy with this information, and a new complaint was set up against Barclays.

One of our investigators considered the complaint but didn’t uphold it. They explained that they couldn’t comment on the previous complaint against BAM but said that they felt Barclays had correctly answered the estate’s query about where BAM operates.

The estate remained unhappy with the investigator’s view and so the complaint was 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’m afraid I can’t comment on the actions of BAM in my decision as this has already been dealt with under a separate complaint reference at our service. As such, my decision will focus solely on the information given to the estate in the final response letter dated 4 September 2024.

In the letter, Barclays explained that explained the Sunderland address for BAM is an inbound mail centre where all UK post is delivered to. It explained that correspondence sent to this address is scanned and dealt with by BAM. It also explained that the telephone call centre and fund centre were based in Ireland, and that’s where the estate’s calls will have been dealt with on behalf of BAM.

Having considered the information provided by Barclays, I don’t find any reason to uphold this complaint. It’s clear that Barclays has provided information regarding where BAM operates and the lines of communication the estate has engaged in and has tried to assist the estate with its queries.

The estate’s concerns seem to be regarding the information that BAM has provided to it, however, as I’ve explained, I cannot comment on the actions of BAM in this decision as BAM

is a separate legal entity to Barclays and a complaint has already been considered against BAM by this service.

My final decision

My final decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

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

Ben Waites
Ombudsman