

## **The complaint**

Mr D has complained Wise Payments Limited, trading as Wise, lodged a fraud-related marker on the industry fraud database, CIFAS, in his name.

## **What happened**

Mr D opened an account with Wise in November 2024. After receiving a report from another bank about a fraudulent credit to Mr D's account in March 2025, Wise decided to close Mr D's account in line with their terms and conditions. They also lodged a fraud-related marker in Mr D's name with CIFAS.

Mr D found that two other accounts he held were being closed and he was advised to check his record with CIFAS. He discovered a CIFAS marker and complained to Wise. He believed this CIFAS marker related to fraudulent documents being provided to Wise at the time the account was opened.

Wise confirmed they didn't feel they'd done anything wrong and refused to remove the marker on Mr D's request.

Mr D brought his complaint to the ombudsman service.

Our investigator noted Mr D's evidence that he'd lent a friend some money in October 2024. The funds he received into his Wise account were on request of that friend who'd asked for a favour for a further friend. She considered Mr D's evidence that he'd passed this money onto his friend after taking back the money he was owed. She was not convinced by his testimony. She felt that Wise had enough evidence to lodge a CIFAS marker.

After receiving the view, Mr D asked an ombudsman to review his complaint.

## **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 done so, I've reached the same outcome as our investigator. I'll explain why.

It is clear what the requirements are prior to lodging a marker. Specifically:

*"There must be reasonable grounds to believe that an identified fraud or financial crime has been committed or attempted.*

*The evidence must be clear, relevant and rigorous."*

Wise must be able to provide clear evidence that an identified fraud was being committed, and Mr D was involved. This means that they must have more than a suspicion or a concern that Mr D may be involved.

There's also a requirement that Wise should be giving the account holder an opportunity to

explain what was going on.

I've seen the evidence provided by Wise. This confirms that another bank raised a fraud claim with them. This related to a payment of £900 which had credited Mr D's Wise account on 6 March. Wise noted that Mr D forwarded this money onto another account in his own name.

They decided to close Mr D's Wise account. They felt they had sufficient evidence to lodge a CIFAS marker. This was recorded on 19 March 2025.

Wise didn't raise any questions at the time they decided to close his account, as I'd have expected them to do. However, it is only a short time before Mr D raises his concerns with Wise. Wise believes at this time they gave him an opportunity to explain the usage of his Wise account.

Mr D told them *"I opened a multi-currency account to manage transactions in different currencies efficiently and avoid high-conversion fees. The primary currencies I planned to use include GPD, USD, EUR and NGN. Funds are typically sent by family, friends and colleague, and deposits are made for reasons such as support cost of living, personal savings, travel expenses, freelance payments, etc"*.

Wise was unconvinced by this and wouldn't remove the CIFAS marker.

Mr D has told us about lending a friend money in October 2024. He's given us a screenshot showing money crediting his friend's account. Another screenshot shows Mr D sending the remainder of the money received on 6 March (minus the £300 he originally lent to this friend) from his other bank account (who I'll call L). He used a money transfer service with the funds then crediting his friend's overseas account.

I have considered this. However, the evidence doesn't completely stack up. There is no evidence from Mr D's account with L of any payment made from there in October 2024 to match what supposedly credited his friend's account overseas. There is a payment from Mr D's account with L on 6 March of £650 and evidence that a payment was made through a money transfer service.

Our investigator asked Mr D why he used so many different methods to make these transactions. I can't see she received a satisfactory explanation. Whilst there is no issue with Mr D paying some money to another friend from his account with L just after he transferred £900 to himself, I would have expected some evidence of the original funds being transferred in October 2024. There is none.

Based on that lack of evidence and explanation from Mr D, along with clear evidence that he was in receipt of fraudulent funds, I believe there is enough evidence to suggest he knew about the fraud.

On this basis, I don't believe it would be fair and reasonable to ask Wise to remove the CIFAS marker.

I know Mr D believed the CIFAS marker was related to fraudulent documents being provided to Wise, but Wise has confirmed this wasn't the case. I can see from the CIFAS marker this relates to a fraudulent payment and that matches what Wise has confirmed.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons given, my final decision is not to uphold Mr D's complaint against Wise

Payments Limited, trading as Wise.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr D to accept or reject my decision before 14 January 2026.

Sandra Quinn  
**Ombudsman**