

Complaint

Mrs B has complained about the overdraft charges HSBC UK Bank Plc (“HSBC”) applied to her current account. She’s effectively said that she shouldn’t have been provided with an overdraft and therefore the charges applied to her account were unfair as they were applied when she was in financial difficulty.

Background

Mrs B opened a current account with HSBC in July 2006. She’s had an overdraft on this account since as far back as 2007. The lowest amount of the limit Mrs B has had has been £100 and at its highest Mrs B’s overdraft limit has been £5,000.00, which it was at the time of her complaint.

In August 2025, Mrs B complained saying that HSBC applied overdraft charges to her account during period where any reviews carried out ought to have shown that she couldn’t afford them. Therefore, these charges were applied while she was experiencing financial difficulty

HSBC didn’t uphold Mrs B’s complaint. It did not think that it had done anything wrong or treated Mrs B unfairly. Mrs B remained dissatisfied after HSBC’s response and referred her complaint to our service. When Mrs B’s complaint was referred to our service, HSBC told us that we couldn’t consider part of it as it was made too late.

One of our investigators reviewed what Mrs B and HSBC had told us. She reached the conclusion that we could look at the entire period Mrs B had her overdraft for. However, she wasn’t persuaded that HSBC had acted unfairly by allowing Mrs B to use her overdraft in a way that was unsustainable or otherwise harmful. So the investigator didn’t think that Mrs B’s complaint should be upheld.

Mrs B disagreed with the investigator and asked for an ombudsman’s decision.

My findings

I’ve considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what’s fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

Basis for my consideration of this complaint

There are time limits for referring a complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service. HSBC has argued that Mrs B’s complaint was made too late because she complained more than six years after some of the charges on the overdraft were applied, as well as more than three years after she ought reasonably to have been aware of her cause to make this complaint.

Having carefully considered everything, I’ve decided not to uphold Mrs B’s complaint. Given the reasons for this, I’m satisfied that whether Mrs B’s complaint about some of the specific charges applied was made in time or not has no impact on that outcome.

Having considered matters, I'm satisfied that it is reasonable to interpret Mrs B's complaint as being one alleging that the lending relationship between Mrs B and HSBC was unfair to Mrs B as described in s140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 ("CCA"). I consider this to be the case as Mrs B has not only complained about the circumstances behind the application of the individual charges, but also the fact HSBC's failure to act during the periods she alleges it ought to have seen she was experiencing difficulty caused ongoing hardship.

I'm therefore satisfied that Mrs B's can therefore reasonably be interpreted as a complaint that the lending relationship between herself and HSBC was unfair to her. I acknowledge the possibility that HSBC may still disagree that we are able to look at the whole of Mrs B's complaint, but given the outcome I have reached, I do not consider it necessary to make any further comment or reach any findings on these matters. This includes Mrs B's arguments on why she believes her complaint was made in time.

In deciding what is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of Mrs B's case, I am required to take relevant law into account. As, for the reasons I've explained above, I'm satisfied that Mrs B's complaint can be reasonably interpreted as being about that her lending relationship with HSBC was unfair to her, relevant law in this case includes s140A, s140B and s140C of the CCA.

S140A says that a court may make an order under s140B if it determines that the relationship between the creditor (HSBC) and the debtor (Mrs B), arising out of a credit agreement is unfair to the debtor because of one or more of the following, having regard to all matters it thinks relevant:

- any of the terms of the agreement;
- the way in which the creditor has exercised or enforced any of his rights under the agreement;
- any other thing done or not done by or on behalf of the creditor.

Case law shows that a court assesses whether a relationship is unfair at the date of the hearing, or if the credit relationship ended before then, at the date it ended. That assessment has to be performed having regard to the whole history of the relationship. S140B sets out the types of orders a court can make where a credit relationship is found to be unfair – these are wide powers, including reducing the amount owed or requiring a refund, or to do or not do any particular thing.

Given Mrs B's complaint, I therefore need to think about whether HSBC's allowing Mrs B to use her overdraft in the way that it did, resulted in the lending relationship between Mrs B and HSBC being unfair to Mrs B, such that it ought to have acted to put right the unfairness – and if so whether it did enough to remove any such unfairness.

Mrs B's relationship with HSBC is therefore likely to be unfair if it allowed Mrs B to continue using her overdraft in circumstances where it ought reasonably to have realised that the facility had become unsustainable or otherwise harmful for her. And if this was the case, HSBC didn't then remove the unfairness this created somehow.

Did HSBC unfairly allow Mrs B to continue using her arranged overdraft in a way that was unsustainable or otherwise harmful for her?

Before I go any further, as this essentially boils down to a complaint that Mrs B was unfairly charged as a result of being allowed to continue using her overdraft, I want to be clear in saying that I haven't considered whether the various amounts HSBC charged were fair and reasonable, or proportionate in comparison to the costs of the service provided. Ultimately,

how much a bank charges for its services is a commercial decision. And it isn't something for me to get involved with.

That said, while I'm not looking at HSBC's charging structure per se, it won't have acted fairly and reasonably towards Mrs B if it applied this interest, fees and charges to Mrs B's account in circumstances where it was aware, or it ought fairly and reasonably to have been aware that there was a clear reason it would have been unfair to do so. I've therefore considered whether such a reason existed which would have resulted in HSBC charging Mrs B unfairly.

Having looked through the account statements HSBC has provided from 2018 onwards, it's clear that Mrs B has been using her overdraft. I'm therefore satisfied that there can be no dispute that Mrs B was using her overdraft over the period of time she's had it. Mrs B's arguments appear to suggest that this in itself means that her complaint should be upheld.

However, Mrs B's overdraft was arranged and was an open-ended agreement credit agreement. This means that Mrs B had an agreement to use her overdraft and as a result she was entitled to use it without having to reapply to do so. Therefore, Mrs B using her overdraft in the period that she had it doesn't automatically mean that her complaint should be upheld.

That said, I do accept that the rules, guidance and industry codes of practice all suggest that prolonged and repeated overdraft usage can sometimes be an indication of financial difficulty. However, it isn't always the case that prolonged and repeated overdraft usage by a customer will always mean that they are, as a matter of fact, in financial difficulty. Indeed, if that were automatically the case, there would be an outright prohibition on revolving credit accounts being open ended, rather than there being a requirement for a lender to review how the facility is being used.

It's also worth saying that one such instance where a lender would be expected to act is where it was clear that the customer was experiencing financial difficulty. Nonetheless, it would need to be objectively clear to the lender, rather than a matter open to interpretation, that the overdraft charges were clearly making things worse and they were harmful as a result.

I've therefore considered whether HSBC acted fairly and reasonably towards Mrs B, in this light. In other words, I've considered whether there were periods where HSBC continued charging Mrs B even though it ought to have instead stepped in and taken corrective measures on the overdraft as it knew, or it ought to have realised, that he was in financial difficulty.

Having looked through Mrs B's account statements throughout the period I have them for, I can't see that HSBC ought reasonably to have realised that Mrs B was experiencing financial difficulty to the extent that it would have been fair and reasonable for it to have unilaterally taken corrective measures in relation to Mrs B's overdraft.

I'll explain why I think this is the case in a little more detail.

To begin with, I can't see Mrs B notified HSBC that she was struggling and that these charges were causing her difficulty. If she had done so, HSBC would have known that the charges were causing harm and I would have expected it to act. Nonetheless, even though I can't see that Mrs B directly told HSBC that she couldn't afford to pay these charges, I've considered whether her account activity ought to have alerted it to this being the case.

In considering this matter, I'm mindful that in order to help with determining whether it is

objectively the case that a customer was experiencing financial hardship, the regulator has set out guidance on what it considers to be potential indicators of financial difficulty. The *'Guidance on financial difficulties'* states that things such as a customer failing to meet consecutive payments to credit, being unable to meet their commitments out of their disposable income, having adverse credit or other insolvency information recorded against them, or being in a debt arrangement should be considered as potential signs of a customer being in financial difficulty.

However, having looked at Mrs B's account transactions, I've seen no indication that any of the potential signs of financial difficulty contained in the guidance, were obviously present in her circumstances during the entire period I've looked at. I also can't see anything in Mrs B's account transactions which suggest that HSBC should have known that she was borrowing from payday or other high-cost lenders, which although not contained in the regulator's guidance, is generally accepted to be an indication that a borrower could be struggling too.

I've also looked at Mrs B's incomings and outgoings as well as her overdrawn balances and determined whether it was possible for her to have stopped using her overdraft, based on this. I think that if Mrs B was locked into paying charges in circumstances where there was no reasonable prospect of her exiting her overdraft then her facility would have been unsustainable for her, even where the indicators of financial difficulties I've set out above weren't clearly present in her circumstances, when looking at the account transactions.

In reviewing this matter, I've noted that throughout the period of time I have statements for, Mrs B's account was in receipt of credits that were sufficient to clear the overdraft within a reasonable period of time. To be clear, I am aware that Mrs B's overdraft limit was sometimes higher than her usual monthly income. However, there isn't a prohibition on a lender providing an overdraft limit that is higher than the amount a consumer typically received each month.

For me the most important thing here is that the funds Mrs B was in receipt of were enough to make inroads into her overdrawn balance. So I'm satisfied that the fund Mrs B received case isn't one where a borrower was marooned in an overdrawn balance towards the top of their limit, with no reasonable prospect of exiting it.

Furthermore, while I'm not seeking to make retrospective value judgements over Mrs B expenditure, there are significant amounts of non-committed, non-contractual and discretionary transactions going from Mrs B's account. As Mrs B herself has referred to the letters that HSBC sent her, I can't reasonably say that she wasn't made aware of the cost of using her overdraft in the way that she was. The fact that Mrs B was able to increase and reduce limit in the way that she did not only suggested that she was responding to the letters but that by flexing up and flexing down her use, Mrs B was using her overdraft sustainably.

I accept that Mrs B may well have had other credit commitments at this time. But this in itself does not mean that she was reliant on credit to meet her essential expenditure. And it isn't immediately obvious to me that Mrs B was borrowing from unsustainable sources – such as payday type lenders – in order to pay for the charges, or meet other committed expenditure either.

Of course, I accept neither of these things in themselves (or when taken together) mean that Mrs B wasn't experiencing difficulty. But I don't think that Mrs B's account conduct and overdraft usage obviously show that she was. And that's what I'd need to be persuaded of in order to uphold her complaint.

Looking from the outside, it looks like Mrs B had the funds to be able to reduce the amount that she used her overdraft and she in fact did do so on multiple occasions. It's also clear that Mrs B's account, on occasion, had sufficient funds to enable her to remove the overdraft completely. I know that Mrs B has said that these funds were being held for other purposes.

However, HSBC won't have known that these funds may have been earmarked for specific purposes. I know Mrs B has suggested that HSBC should have sought to check this with her to avoid any misunderstanding. However, as I'm satisfied that it is more likely than not that Mrs B did not directly tell HSBC that she was experiencing financial difficulty, I don't think that HSBC was required to check whether these funds were earmarked for other purposes either. Equally, while I'm sorry to hear about everything Mrs B has been through and it's clear that she had a difficult time. I don't think that HSBC knew this or had reason to suspect any of this either.

So, in these circumstances, I think that HSBC was reasonably entitled to conclude that Mrs B was choosing to use her overdraft in the way that she was rather than it being the case that she had become reliant on it.

Therefore, I don't think that Mrs B was obviously locked into using her overdraft and paying the charges for doing so. In my view, there was a reasonable prospect of Mrs B exiting her overdraft. And HSBC was reasonably entitled to believe that Mrs B was choosing to use her overdraft in the way that she was, rather than a case that her financial circumstances meant that she had no choice other than to do so.

Bearing all of this in mind, I've not been persuaded that HSBC created unfairness in its relationship with Mrs B by allowing her to use her overdraft in the way that she. Based on what I've seen, I don't find HSBC treated Mrs B unfairly in any other way either.

Overall and having considered everything, while I can understand Mrs B's sentiments and appreciate why she is unhappy, I'm nonetheless not upholding this complaint. I appreciate this will be very disappointing for Mrs B. But I hope she'll understand the reasons for my decision and that she'll at least feel her concerns have been listened to.

My final decision

For the reasons I've explained, I'm not upholding Mrs B's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs B to accept or reject my decision before 4 May 2026.

Jeshen Narayanan
Ombudsman