

The complaint

Mr K complains that there was a delay in transferring funds from the account he held with Skrill Limited and it did not offer him appropriate support.

What happened

Mr K holds a US Dollar account with Skrill. Between 5 and 18 June 2025 he attempted a number of times unsuccessfully to withdraw \$2,000 to another account. On 20 June 2025 he was able to make the transfer.

Mr K complains that Skrill delayed the payment he wanted to make and that it did not offer him appropriate support. He was exchanging the funds to another currency and the delay meant he lost money. He also said Skrill applied a fee and an unfair exchange rate when it transferred the funds.

The investigator did not think that Skrill had made any error in carrying out the transfer. But she did not think that it had done enough to help Mr K. She said it should therefore pay him £100.

Mr K accepted what the investigator said, Skrill did not. It said it was only willing to offer Mr K £50.

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.

All the parties appear to have accepted that Skrill was not responsible for the delay in the transfer taking place. I am satisfied it was due to an issue with the card issuer of the account Mr K was seeking to transfer the funds to. I am also satisfied that both the fee and exchange rate were applied in line with the terms of the account – and they were set out in a clear, fair and not misleading way to Mr K.

I agree with the investigator that when Mr K contacted Skrill when the transfers were unsuccessful it did not do enough to help him. First, it took Skrill around 13 days to respond to Mr K's initial query rather than the 24 hours it promised. Second, when it did respond its response was generic. It ought to have explained fully the specific issue Mr K was facing and what he needed to do to achieve his financial objectives.

Therefore I do not consider Skrill treated Mr K fairly. It did not give him the information he needed in a timely way so that he could make an informed decision what to do. That has clearly caused Mr K distress and inconvenience. He had the trouble of attempting the transaction a number of times without success, had to chase up Skrill along with the stress and worry caused by this matter as a whole over around two weeks.

Our published guidelines say that an apology or small monetary award of less than £100 will fairly compensate a one-off incident such as a small mistake or short delay. But we'd make

an award between £100 and £300 where there have been repeated small errors or a larger single mistake that requires a reasonable effort to sort out, with some stress or a milder impact over a few days or even weeks.

I've found that there was avoidable stress caused to Mr K by the delay in contacting him and the response he was given. This matter was clearly important to him and the funds were important to Mr K. In all the circumstances, I agree with the investigator that £100 is a fair amount to reflect the impact of this matter on Mr K.

Skrill has said £50 would be an appropriate amount of compensation. But it has not explained why or shown that it has taken into account our published guidance. So for the reasons I've explained, it should pay Mr K £100

My final decision

My final decision is that Skrill Limited should pay Mr K £100. Skrill limited must pay the compensation within 28 days of the date on which we tell it Mr K accepts my final decision. If it pays later than this it must also pay interest on the compensation from the deadline date for settlement to the date of payment at 8% a year simple.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr K to accept or reject my decision before 5 January 2026.

Ken Rose
Ombudsman