

The complaint

Mr P complains about the time taken by Computershare Investor Services Plc (CIS) to transfer some of his shares to a new provider.

What happened

One of our Investigators looked into the complaint and thought CIS should pay Mr P some compensation for the service he received.

After reviewing everything I came to a different view to that of our Investigator.

I issued a provisional decision on 18 September 2025 in which I said:

Mr P has provided a lot of information about the complaint and it's clear how strongly he feels about what happened. I want to assure Mr P that I've read and considered everything that has been submitted even if I don't mention it all in detail. I've summarised some things which reflects the informal nature of our service.

Our Investigator provided a detailed timeline of events which wasn't disputed by either party. Because of this I won't repeat all the details here. Having looked at what happened I'm satisfied that timeline is a fair and correct version of events.

The matter for me to decide is whether CIS are responsible for any delays; and considering all the available evidence I'm not persuaded that's the case.

The first transfer form was completed with a number of shares that the new provider couldn't accept. During that process CIS had to chase the new provider on two occasions due to non-response. This delayed the process which was eventually cancelled as it didn't settle on time.

The second transfer form was correctly completed. During this process CIS also had to chase the new provider twice due to non-response. Again, this added time to how long the transfer took before it was completed.

I couldn't say for certain how much time was added onto both transfer requests due to the non-response from the new provider. But I can say that the whole process would've been completed quicker, perhaps a week or so quicker, had more timely responses been received.

Both transfers were actioned within CIS' service level agreement of 20 working days. And I haven't seen any evidence of delays from CIS outside that timeframe. CIS makes customers aware of the time frame when a transfer request is submitted.

Our Investigator upheld the complaint not because they thought CIS made errors with the transfer, but because they thought more could've been done to complete the correct transfer before the end of the tax year. I agree that I haven't seen any persuasive evidence of errors made by CIS in the process. However I don't agree that CIS needed to offer any further help with the correct transfer outside the usual service level agreement.

I don't think CIS made any errors when processing the transfers. So it follows that I don't think any extra service needed to be provided during the process. Had CIS made errors with the first transfer request then the situation would be different. However I'm not persuaded that's the case.

It's not in dispute that Mr P contacted CIS during the process and made them aware of the need for the transfer to happen as soon as possible as it was nearing the end of the tax year. That time of year is very busy for all businesses like CIS. I don't think it would've been appropriate for them to prioritise Mr P over other customers.

Mr P said that CIS have a duty to help with consumers desired financial outcomes as well as customer and financial support, but I can't reasonably say that would include prioritising one consumer over another when processing a transfer request.

When dealing with CIS Mr P said that the issue with the first transfer was because of the way their system worked which didn't present the correct options. It's not the role of this service to tell a business what products and procedures they should offer. So even if I was to agree with Mr P, and I haven't seen any persuasive evidence that this was the cause of the problem, I couldn't say their systems and how they worked was incorrect.

There was an issue with the rekeying of the first transfer to allow for dividend payments to be made. But this had no impact on why the first transfer didn't proceed.

I know that what happened was, and remains, frustrating for Mr P and I don't doubt there was inconvenience caused. However looking at everything that happened I'm not persuaded CIS made any errors in the process.

Having carefully considered everything that happened I'm satisfied CIS treated Mr P fairly and reasonably so won't be asking them to take any further action.

I asked both parties to provide me with any further submissions before I issued my final decision.

Mr P replied disagreeing with the decision saying that many of the causes of the problem were within the remit of CIS.

There was no response from CIS.

The complaint has now been passed back to me for a 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 carefully thought about the response from Mr P I find myself coming to the same conclusion as my provisional decision.

Mr P has provided further comment on issues already raised and that have been considered. I want to assure Mr P that I have taken into consideration everything that has been provided.

I also think it's important to say that CIS don't offer advice. What they can do is provide information to allow customers to make their own informed decision. And I'm not persuaded

that CIS gave any incorrect information when dealing with Mr P.

I think it's also worth reiterating, as I said in my provisional decision, that there were delays with CIS getting responses from the new provider. And I think these delays added about a week onto the time the transfer took. If not for these delays it would seem most likely, or at least quite probable, that the transfer would've taken place within the tax year as Mr P wanted to do.

Mr P says he didn't receive the support he required, and considering everything that happened I can see why he feels this way. However I'm not persuaded that CIS made any mistakes in the transfer procedure. I know there was frustration about having to submit more than one transfer request, and with the overall time it took, but I haven't seen any persuasive evidence of unreasonable delays, which Mr P has mentioned in his reply.

I've considered everything that happened, and all the information which has been submitted. Having done so I'm satisfied CIS treated Mr P fairly and reasonably so won't be asking them to take any further action.

My final decision

For the reasons I've explained above, my decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr P to accept or reject my decision before 1 December 2025.

Warren Wilson

Ombudsman