

The complaint

Mr B complains about how The Royal Bank of Scotland Plc (RBS) handled his accounts following his bankruptcy.

What happened

In January 2025, Mr B entered into bankruptcy. As a result, RBS were notified as he had a current account and credit card account with it. The bankruptcy information was actioned on his current account, but he noticed the same hadn't happened for this credit card. And so he contacted RBS to let it know.

Initially, Mr B contacted a different entity of RBS, it couldn't help him and directed him to the RBS website for the correct contact information. Mr B didn't think this was very helpful, as he felt it should have been easy for that part of RBS to refer his query. He also explained that he has a condition that makes it difficult to communicate over the phone.

Mr B added that RBS had updated his credit file information to show that he had missed a payment on his credit card, which he said wasn't accurate because he wasn't required to make one under the bankruptcy.

In addition to this, Mr B complains that he wasn't notified that his account would default.

To put things right, Mr B would like RBS to:

- Remove the missed payment (reporting for February) from his credit file. And update this with all three credit reference agencies.
- Confirmation that his accounts have been closed and that his request has been actioned.
- An apology and compensation for the stress, aggravation and inconvenience.

RBS responded to Mr B's complaint and upheld it in part. It said it had updated the bankruptcy information on the current account on 28 January 2025, but it didn't update the credit card information until 11 February 2025. It paid Mr B £50 for this and it said it would backdate the default on the credit card account. However, it didn't uphold Mr B's complaint about the other points. It explained that it followed the correct process in defaulting the account, and Mr B's insolvency practitioner should have provided him with the information relating to this. It also explained that Mr B had contacted a separate division of RBS and this department wouldn't be able to help him, but it did provide him with the website where there is the correct contact information.

An Investigator considered the information provided by both parties, but they felt the £50 RBS had already offered Mr B was enough to put things right. While they noted there was a delay in the bankruptcy information being recorded, they felt that the matter had been rectified quickly. They also stated that RBS didn't need to notify Mr B of the account defaulting. And the Investigator explained that Mr B's complaint about the other entity of

RBS couldn't be considered as part of their investigation because it was about an entirely separate legal entity to the RBS complaint being considered under this case.

Mr B didn't agree with the Investigator's view. He said RBS had awarded him £100 for a separate matter, and so it should do the same in this case. The Investigator explained why they didn't think RBS needed to do more.

Because an agreement couldn't be reached, the complaint has been passed to me to decide on the matter.

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 considered the available evidence, I'm satisfied that RBS has already done enough to put things right.

The Investigator has already provided a detailed explanation as to what has happened in this case, and why they felt that RBS had done enough to compensate Mr B for the mistake it made. I have very little to add to what the Investigator has already said, and so I will keep my findings on the matter brief.

- RBS has accepted that it should have updated the credit card information at the same time as the current account information. I'm persuaded that the information was updated quickly once it became aware. I accept this would have taken Mr B some effort to sort out and cause some levels of inconvenience and possibly distress. But I'm not persuaded the impact to Mr B is more than this. Given that RBS acted quickly to put things right, I'm satisfied its offer of £50 is enough here, and in line with this Service's approach to distress and inconvenience awards.
- Although RBS has awarded higher compensation on a separate matter, each case is considered on its own merits. And, for the reasons I've explained above, I'm satisfied £50 compensation is a fair outcome for this complaint.
- The RBS that this complaint is about isn't the same legal entity as the firm that he initially contacted, that he said was unhelpful. I can't consider complaints about two different firms in one complaint. And so I can't make a finding about the actions of that firm in this decision. If Mr B wants to pursue this matter, he can raise a complaint to the firm he initially contacted for them to investigate.
- When a firm receives notification that a customer has been made bankrupt, it should automatically default the account. This is part of the process and there's no requirement for it to have notified Mr B of this beforehand.

My final decision

For the reasons set out above, I don't uphold Mr B's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr B to accept or reject my decision before 13 November 2025.

Sophie Wilkinson
Ombudsman