

The complaint

Mrs A complains Barclays Bank UK PLC didn't set up a group of standing orders correctly causing her distress when they didn't go out on the correct date. She's also unhappy about the way Barclays Bank UK PLC handled her complaint.

What happened

Mrs A has an account with Barclays from which she makes regular payments – donations. She asked Barclays to set up a group of standing orders so that these payments would go out every four weeks on a Thursday. The standing orders worked on the first two occasions but not on the third occasion. Mrs A contacted Barclays to find out what had gone wrong.

Barclays investigated and said that the payments hadn't gone out on the previous day – as Mrs A had expected them to – because the standing orders had been set up so that the payments would go out on the third Thursday of the month. Barclays has since accepted – as far as I can see – that this wasn't what Mrs A intended and that the standing orders should have been set up to go out every 28 days. Barclays offered £25 in compensation – as a goodwill gesture – but paid this automatically into Mrs A's account without her agreement. Mrs A complained about the standing orders being set up incorrectly and compensation being paid into her account without her agreement. Barclays offered an additional £25 in compensation. Mrs A complained to our service as she was unhappy with Barclays' response and the compensation it had offered.

One of our investigators looked into Mrs A's complaint and recommended £150 in compensation. Both parties disagreed with our investigator's recommendation. Mrs A said she thought £200 in compensation was more appropriate and explained why. Barclays, on the other hand, thought £150 in compensation was excessive and explained why. Mrs A's complaint was, as a result, passed to me.

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.

There's no longer a dispute – as far as I can see – that Barclays made a mistake when it set up the standing orders Mrs A wanted in place. If I'm wrong and there is still a dispute about this, then that would be my finding. The only issue I have to decide, therefore, is whether or not the £50 compensation Barclays ultimately offered was fair and, if not, what would fairly compensate Mrs A for the impact of Barclays' errors.

I've listened to the calls Mrs A has had with our service and considered everything both parties have sent us. Having done so, I'm satisfied that it was important that the standing orders worked correctly as Mrs A was relying on these payments going out in time so she knew the rest of the money in her account was money she could spend. In other words, it was important to her and her budgeting that her balance was correct. The standing orders not going out unsettled this process. I'm satisfied the original agent who dealt with Mrs A's complaint further unsettled this process when they paid £25 into Mrs A's account without her knowledge or consent. I can, therefore, see why Mrs A feels £50 in compensation doesn't fairly reflect the distress this caused her.

Putting things right

Our investigator recommended £150 in compensation based on our guidelines in relation to awarding compensation. I agree that £150 is a more appropriate level of compensation and fair and don't agree in this particular case – not least given what Mrs A has told us – that it's excessive. So, that's the award I'm going to make.

My final decision

My final decision is that I uphold this complaint and require Barclays Bank UK PLC to pay Mrs A £150 in compensation in full and final settlement.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs A to accept or reject my decision before 6 February 2026.

Nicolas Atkinson
Ombudsman