

The complaint

Mr M is unhappy that Atom Bank PLC won't agree to return the funds he invested into a five-year fixed saver account, without him first providing statements for other accounts that he holds.

What happened

Mr M opened a five-year fixed saver account with Atom Bank in July 2025, investing £10,000.

In September 2025, Mr M contacted Atom to let it know he'd been made unemployed. He asked how he could close his account, as he needed access to the funds. Atom's agent told Mr M the account didn't end until January 2030. The agent said it would consider Mr M's request under its hardship policy, and that in order to consider this, Mr M needed to send supporting documents, including statements for any accounts held outside of Atom.

Mr M told Atom he could provide proof he wasn't working, but that he wasn't prepared to share personal banking details, in order to get his money back. Atom maintained that this was a requirement, and Mr M complained.

Atom didn't uphold the complaint. It reiterated it was prepared to consider Mr M's request to access the funds, but that in order to do so, it did need Mr M to provide the information it had requested.

Mr M remained unhappy with this and referred his concerns to the Financial Ombudsman Service. An Investigator here issued an assessment of the case. In summary, they didn't think Atom was acting unfairly in requiring Mr M to provide the account information it had requested. Mr M asked for the matter to be escalated to an Ombudsman, and the case has been passed to me to make 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 done so, I've reached the same overall outcome as the Investigator, for broadly the same reasons.

Under the terms and conditions of the account Mr M opened, the funds added wouldn't be available until the end of the fixed-rate term – in this case, in 2030.

Such a term isn't inherently unfair – and it was what Mr M agreed to when he opened the account.

Mr M hasn't suggested that Atom didn't make this clear to him, but I've reviewed the information Mr M would've seen as he went through the application, and I'm satisfied Atom made this clear enough.

The crux of this complaint is that Mr M doesn't think it's fair for Atom to insist that he provide account statements, in order that it can further consider his request to access the funds early.

However, I don't agree. I acknowledge Mr M's concerns about privacy, but there's no indication that Atom would be reviewing the statement information for any other reason than assessing whether his circumstances mean he can access the funds early, under its hardship policy.

It's reasonable for Atom to have such a policy and I don't consider it unreasonable in this case for Atom to insist that Mr M provide the account information it's requested, in order to further consider his request to access the funds early.

So, whilst I appreciate this will come as a disappointment to Mr M, I haven't found that Atom has acted unfairly, and I don't uphold his complaint.

I'd add that it seems open to Mr M to provide Atom with the information it's requested, so that it can then further consider his request to access the funds early.

My decision

My final decision is that I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr M to accept or reject my decision before 7 January 2026.

Ben Brewer
Ombudsman