

The complaint

The complaint arises from a transfer of funds Mr S made from an account he holds with a bank I'll refer to as N to a new saving account with Charter Court Financial Services Limited trading as Charter Savings Bank (CSB). It's one of two complaints he's asked us to look at about problems he encountered when the Confirmation of Payee (CoP) system returned a "no match" alert when he first set up the payment instruction with N to send money to CSB.

The first complaint, which was referred to us in September 2025, was about how N handled Mr S' attempts to match the details before sending money to CSB.

The second complaint, the one I'm dealing with here, also came to us in September 2025, and is about how CSB handled Mr S' attempts to match the details before sending money to it.

The Investigator to whom the case was allocated didn't think CSB had done anything wrong. Mr S has asked for the case to be reviewed by an ombudsman.

What happened

The broad circumstances of this complaint are known to the parties. I'm also aware that the investigator issued a response to the complaint, a copy of which has been sent to both parties, and so I don't need to repeat the details here. Our decisions are published, and it's important that I don't include any information that might result in Mr S being identified.

Instead I'll focus on giving the reasons for my decision. If I don't mention something, it won't be because I've ignored it. It'll be because I didn't think it was material to the outcome of the complaint. For the avoidance of any doubt or ambiguity, this decision deals solely with the complaint against CSB.

What I've decided – and why

I'll start with some general observations. We're not the regulator of financial businesses, and we don't "police" their internal processes or how they operate generally. That's the job of the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA). We deal with individual disputes between businesses and their customers.

In doing that, we don't replicate the work of the courts. Whilst statutory, our scheme is intended to provide swift outcomes to disputes between business and the customers, with a minimum of formality. We're impartial, and we don't take either side's instructions on how we investigate a complaint. We conduct our investigations and reach our conclusions without interference from anyone else. But in doing so, we have to work within the rules of the ombudsman service.

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

Like the Investigator, I've confined myself to addressing the complaint about what CSB did or didn't do. Our consideration of the case about N was entirely separate.

To find in Mr S's favour and uphold this complaint, I have to be persuaded first of all that CSB either failed to do something that it should have done, or did something that it should not have done. If that test is met, I then have to be persuaded on the balance of probabilities that Mr S suffered detriment, whether that be financial or non-financial, that was a reasonably foreseeable consequence of an act or omission on CSB's part. Having considered everything that has been said and provided, I don't find that either test has been met. I'll explain why.

Mr S has acknowledged that the account opening material CSB provided gave him the correct information to key in when setting up the payment instruction from N. It's now accepted that the reason he received a "no match" alert is because CSB is not a subscriber to the CoP system, which is run by an independent operator. I appreciate everything Mr S has said about why he believes CSB should subscribe to CoP, but having no regulatory power means it's not within my remit to order it to subscribe, or even to say that CSB is at fault for not having done so already.

CSB told Mr S on the phone that it didn't subscribe to CoP. I've noted what Mr S has said about the call handler not expressly saying this might be the reason for the "no match" alert, but I think that would have been a reasonable inference to draw. In any event, it seems to me from listening to the call that the handler considered Mr S' question on that point carefully and answered it as well as she able to.

Overall, I'm not persuaded CSB has either failed to do something that it should have done, or did something that it should not have done. For completeness, however, I've still considered the question of detriment.

First of all, there's no suggestion Mr S has suffered financial detriment. He maintains that he *has* suffered considerable non-financial detriment in the form of the stress and worry he experienced. A great deal of what Mr S has said on the latter point seems to derive from the manner in which the CoP system operates, in particular the stark nature of the "no match" alert, and the potential worry that could cause. But that's not something that's within CSB's control; nor even would it be if CSB was a subscriber to CoP.

It's quite understandable that Mr S would be worried about the potential risk of his money being lost if the transfer instruction was incorrectly set up. But that potential threat, and the stress it might induce, were both mitigated as soon as Mr S was aware that the first payment of £1 had arrived safely. After that, Mr S soon made further deposits totalling £85,000. I don't think it likely Mr S would have made the additional deposits if he was still stressed about the risk of losing his money. Whilst his general unhappiness with the situation remained, and clearly still does, that's not a reason to award compensation.

My final decision

My final decision is that I don't uphold this complaint or make any order or award against Charter Court Financial Services Limited trading as Charter Savings Bank.

My final decision concludes this service's consideration of this complaint, which means I'll not be engaging in any further consideration or discussion of the merits of it.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr S to accept or reject my decision before 12 January 2026.

Jeff Parrington

Ombudsman