

The complaint

Mr J has complained about how Barclays Bank UK PLC (“Barclays”) dealt with his query when a friend paid money into a closed account.

What happened

Mr J’s friend transferred money to Mr J, but by mistake paid the money into an account that had closed.

Mr J contacted Barclays about the payment, but was told he’d need to go to a branch to get the matter resolved. Mr J says that he told Barclays he was unable to go to a branch and was told in response that the money could not be located without him attending branch. Unhappy with how matters had been handled, Mr J complained to Barclays.

After Mr J experienced some difficulties in raising his complaint, Barclays considered Mr J’s complaint and upheld it. Barclays asked Mr J to obtain the details of the Faster Payment ID and the date the money was sent from the sender, and Barclays would then be able to locate the money. Barclays acknowledged that it hadn’t handled matters as well as it could’ve and so paid Mr J £150. Barclays confirmed that Mr J’s closed account was in credit by £18.34 and asked that Mr J contact its financial assistance team to arrange for the money to be paid to Mr J.

Shortly after this, Mr J says he received a letter from Barclays which confirmed money had been paid into his closed account and that Mr J would need to get in contact to arrange for the money to be paid to Mr J.

Following further contact with Mr J, Barclays issued a further response to the complaint and again acknowledged that it had not handled matters well. It agreed to pay Mr J a further £50, so as to bring the compensation up to a total of £200.

After referring his complaint to this service, one of our investigators assessed the complaint and they concluded that what Barclays had already done to put things right was reasonable.

As Mr J didn’t accept the investigator’s assessment, the matter was referred for an ombudsman’s decision.

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 reviewed everything, I don’t uphold this complaint for broadly the same reasons that the investigator gave.

It’s not in doubt that Barclays didn’t handle matters as well as it could’ve. Money had been paid into Mr J’s closed account. So when Mr J contacted Barclays to get the money

redirected, I think that Barclays should've reviewed Mr J's closed account to check if money had been paid into it. And if it was the case that the person who Mr J spoke to couldn't reviewed closed accounts, then I think Barclays could've arranged for the relevant department that can access closed accounts to check Mr J's account and get back to Mr J.

When Mr J contacted Barclays, he was told to visit a branch - even though Mr J told Barclays he was unable to visit a branch due to his vulnerabilities. It's clear that doing this added to Mr J's distress and it seems that this was quite unnecessary, as even Barclays acknowledged (in its second response to Mr J's complaint) that Mr J could've been identified over the phone and his complaint looked into over the phone.

I note that, despite contacting Barclays to raise his complaint, Mr J was unable to do so. And Barclays didn't call Mr J back when asked to do so either. Mr J also says that Barclays told him it was unable to trace the payment, when that clearly was incorrect, given that Barclays was aware that money had been paid into his closed account, and had written to him, asking that he get in contact.

So overall, I agree with Mr J that Barclays should've handled - what was a relatively straightforward matter - things better than it did. Therefore, all that is left for me to consider is whether more compensation is warranted.

Mr J says that, because his friend paid the money into his closed account, this meant he was unable to eat. Given that the amount in question was relatively small, our investigator asked Mr J for evidence to show that he had no money to eat, because if that was the case, then I'd agree the impact of Barclays' poor handling of matters would indeed have been significant, and I would've considered increasing the award. However, Mr J didn't provide this service with such evidence.

Therefore, based on the evidence I have been provided with, and taking into account what Mr J has told us about his circumstances, overall, I think that the £200 compensation paid by Barclays is fair and reasonable.

I say this bearing in mind that, although Mr J unfortunately was inconvenienced in pursuing a complaint and faced difficulty in doing so, at the same time I am mindful that Barclays did write to him on 13 May 2025 explaining that money had been paid into his account and provided him with a telephone number for him to call to arrange for the money to be paid out to him. I can also see that Barclays had said the same when it responded to Mr J's complaint on 23 May 2025. And ultimately, given that the account that the money was paid into had been closed for a number of years, I do think some of the fault for the delay in Mr J receiving the money lay with the person who sent it, for not checking they had the correct bank details in the first place.

As such, whilst it's not in doubt that Barclays got things wrong here, I do think that the £200 it paid Mr J was fair and reasonable compensation in the circumstances. So, I don't think Barclays needs to do anything further in relation to this complaint.

My final decision

Because of the reasons given above, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr J to accept or reject my decision before 26 November 2025.

Thomas White

Ombudsman