

## **The complaint**

Mr A complains that Metro Bank PLC blocked and closed his account. He would like to know the reason and receive compensation for the distress and inconvenience.

## **What happened**

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties, so I won't repeat them again here. Instead, I'll focus on giving my reason for my 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 decided to partially uphold this complaint. I'll explain why below.

- Metro has extensive legal and regulatory obligations which UK legislation places on it as a regulated financial business. Including the responsibility to protect its customers from financial harm and to prevent and detect financial crime. As part of its ongoing responsibilities Metro reviewed Mr A's account. Following the review Mr A's account was closed on 13 August 2025.
- Banks are entitled to end their business relationship with a customer, as long as it's done fairly and is in line with the terms and conditions of the account. Banks should, however, give reasonable notice before closing an account. Usually that means 60 days' notice, but it can be less depending on the circumstances. In this case Metro gave Mr A one week's notice of the closure of his account.
- I appreciate Mr A wants to know the reason for the closure of his account. He has said Metro hasn't been transparent and has breached regulations by not giving him specific reasons. I must highlight that when reviewing complaints this service considers a wide range of sources – this includes the law, regulatory guidance and good industry practice. I can assure Mr A that our approach to cases of this nature factors in these various sources and issues. Whilst Mr A may have expected to be given the specific reasons for the account closure. Metro isn't required to give him a specific reason. And I can understand Mr A's frustration that he hasn't been provided with a detailed explanation. But as the investigator has explained, Metro is under no obligation to provide this information to him. So, I can't say Metro has done anything wrong by not giving Mr A this information.
- In considering whether Metro acted fairly in closing Mr A's account I've also looked at the terms and conditions of his account. The terms and conditions outline that the bank can close a customer's account with two months' notice, and in certain circumstances they can close an account immediately. In this case Metro closed Mr A's account without the full notice. For Metro to act fairly here they needed to meet the criteria to apply their terms for immediate closure – and having looked at these terms and all the evidence, I'm not satisfied that the bank has applied the terms fairly.

- Metro have agreed that they should have given Mr A two months' notice of the closure of his account. Metro returned the balance of Mr A's account amounting to £26.75 to an account he nominated.
- Metro have offered Mr A £100 in compensation for this error. Mr A is unhappy with this amount and would like more compensation. Mr A suggested that £2,500 would be a more appropriate amount of compensation. Mr A said this was his main account and it was very inconvenient to have his account closed at such short notice. He was unable to pay his bills, his credit score suffered and he had anxiety and mental health issues as a result of the closure. He said he had to borrow money from pay day loans and from family and friends. He said he incurred defaults and late payment charges. I am very sorry to hear how this issue has affected Mr A.
- I've considered how Metro's actions impacted Mr A. I've no doubt having his current account closed with only a week's notice was a shock to him. So, I can appreciate this would've been inconvenient and upsetting for him.
- I have taken on board what Mr A has said about how Metro's actions impacted him, but I note Mr A has mentioned that he had a business account. So, although the Metro account was his main account, I'm satisfied he had access to other banking services when his Metro account closed. I can see that a direct debit for £67.97 was unpaid on the 7 August but this was due to insufficient funds in the account and not the account closure. I have looked at the evidence provided by Mr A, in particular his credit score information and defaults – having done so I can't say that the issues he has told us about are as a direct result of the account closure. I say this because Mr A had missed direct debits before the closure of his Metro account.
- I've also kept in mind Mr A would always have had to spend time sorting things out even if things happened as they should have – in particular, that Metro would still have closed Mr A's account. As I've said, I've considered Mr A's further comments about why he thinks he should get more compensation. But these don't change my conclusions. I think the amount of £100 is reasonable and fair in the circumstances and I won't be awarding any more.

I appreciate Mr A will be unhappy with my decision. Having looked at the information and all the evidence provided by both parties I am satisfied that Metro was entitled to close the account. Metro should have given Mr A 60 days' notice of the closure. They should pay Mr A £100 compensation for the inconvenience they caused him with the immediate closure.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is I partially uphold this complaint. I direct Metro Bank PLC to pay Mr A £100 compensation for the inconvenience caused.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr A to accept or reject my decision before 11 March 2026.

Esperanza Fuentes  
**Ombudsman**