

The complaint

Mr P has complained about how Monzo Bank Ltd (Monzo) handled a refund claim.

What happened

Mr P used his Monzo debit card to purchase a coaching programme from a supplier I shall call 'N' in January 2024. This was paid with two transactions of £3,350.40 and £3,777.75 and was for a period of 90 days to learn how to scale up an e-commerce business.

However, Mr P had concerns with how the programme was delivered and so raised these issues with N. As they weren't addressed to his satisfaction, he then contacted Monzo in February 2024 to raise a chargeback claim against 'N'.

Monzo considered his chargeback claim but felt there was insufficient evidence for a reasonable prospect of success if it was progressed further. They said Mr P had already attended the programme and accessed the tools and support. In addition they couldn't see sufficient evidence of any other assurances given that weren't delivered.

Mr P didn't agree and so referred his complaint to this service. Our investigator considered the available evidence but reached the same conclusions as Monzo and so didn't think they needed to do anything more.

Mr P didn't agree and asked for an ombudsman to issue a final decision 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.

I've read and considered the evidence submitted by the parties but won't comment on it all – only the matters I consider to be central to this complaint. This isn't intended as a discourtesy but reflects my role in resolving disputes informally.

It's important to note that Monzo aren't the provider of the services here – so in deciding what is fair and reasonable, I'm looking at their particular role as a provider of financial services. In doing so I note that because Mr P paid for this transaction using a Monzo debit card, a chargeback could possibly help him. So in deciding what is fair and reasonable I've focused on this

Chargeback

Chargeback is the process by which settlement disputes are resolved between card issuers and merchants. A consumer isn't entitled to chargeback by right. But where there are grounds to raise one and it has reasonable grounds for success, it is good practice for one to be raised by the card issuer.

However, a chargeback isn't guaranteed to succeed and is governed by the limitations of the particular card scheme rules (in this case Mastercard). I've considered the relevant chargeback rules in deciding whether Monzo acted fairly.

The most relevant chargeback code here would be 'Goods or Services were Either Not as Described or Defective'. I've therefore considered the evidence available with regard to this chargeback rule and whether Monzo acted fairly when they declined Mr P's claim.

Did Monzo act reasonably in declining the chargeback claim?

I note Mr P took part fully in the programme so would've received benefit from this. Still, there could be some consideration to whether the service was defective or not as described with mind to Mastercard's chargeback rules and the relevant evidence provided.

Mr P's concerns were the following:

- Their coach was largely unresponsive for two months of the programme.
- He was told a £2,000 advertising budget would be enough to reach the programme targets within 90 days but he felt this wasn't possible.
- He was pressurised into paying additional amounts to N's own advertising agency, something he was not advised of before.

Mr P provided some screenshots of chat messages with N and while these show him expressing his concerns, there isn't any further evidence to support that the services weren't as described or defective.

I've also reviewed N's coaching agreement with Mr P and section 12.1 called 'Guarantee' states they do not 'warrant or guarantee any specific level of performance or results'. 12.2 then states that N guarantees that clients who do general drop shipping will make 100,000 Euros in revenue within the three months of coaching but if not, the coaching will continue for free until this is achieved.

However, this will only apply if the client has truthfully implemented everything the programme and the coaches had to teach.

In Mr P's case, while I appreciate his concerns, there is insufficient evidence here for a reasonable prospect of success, had the chargeback proceeded further under Mastercard rules. I say this because there isn't a guarantee of a specific level of performance from N's terms and conditions.

In addition, there is insufficient evidence around the advertising budget stated and whether it was reasonable for it to be exceeded in Mr P's circumstances, and likewise what happened regarding the service given by the assigned coach.

While the coach was eventually replaced, that doesn't necessarily mean that the service provided was defective as there is no further information on what happened there beyond Mr P's testimony that he was largely unresponsive. Without any further documentary or other evidence, this wouldn't be enough to say the service was not to the standard expected.

Likewise while I understand Mr P thinks he was pressurised into making additional payments, I've not seen any documentary evidence showing this occurred and this meant the service was different from described.

In summary, the coaching course was attended, and under chargeback rules I can't say Monzo did anything wrong here in not progressing the claim based on Mr P's submissions, as there wasn't a reasonable prospect of success had they done so.

And while I appreciate Mr P has said N misrepresented the service to him during the original sales call, again there isn't any further evidence about these discussions to show the services were then not as described.

I know this'll be disappointing for Mr P, but I won't be asking Monzo to do anything more.

My final decision

For the reasons explained, I won't be upholding this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr P to accept or reject my decision before 9 December 2025.

Viral Patel
Ombudsman