

The complaint

Mr S complains that National Westminster Bank PLC (“NatWest”) requested the return of his loan money too early.

What happened

Mr S says he cancelled his loan on 20 June 2025 and, later, received a letter saying repayment was due by 10 July 2025. This was earlier than the 30-day period he’d expected. He says he didn’t receive the letter until 11 July and called NatWest the following day as he was very concerned about any negative impact on his credit file. Mr S says that he was expecting to have received some money in time to repay the loan, but, instead, he had to sell gold which, he says, caused him to incur a loss of £500.

NatWest accepts that it made an error and says Mr S should have been given until 20 July 2025 to make the repayment. It paid Mr S £150 to compensate him for the inconvenience.

Our investigator did not recommend the complaint should be upheld. She acknowledged that NatWest had made an error in requesting the money by 10 July but could not hold it responsible for him selling his assets. She agreed that compensation of £150 to be fair and reasonable.

Mr S responded to say, in summary, that the agent on the call was confused and couldn’t confirm what was said in the letter.

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.

I have listened to the call in full from 12 July 2025 and, although the agent was initially confused, I am satisfied she understood the issue after a few minutes. She confirmed that the letter was wrong and that the correct repayment due date was 20 July 2025.

That said, Mr S was clearly concerned about potential issues with being late with the payment and, as he had the money in his current account, he asked the agent to use it to repay the loan that day.

I acknowledge that Mr S said he had to sell some assets to have the money available to him earlier than he anticipated he’d need it, but it is not reasonable to hold NatWest responsible for any losses he said he incurred on the sale.

However, I do find it is reasonable that Mr S should be compensated for the distress caused to him by NatWest's error. NatWest has paid Mr S £150 for this, and I'm satisfied that this is in accordance with our usual awards

In summary, while I recognise the worry this error caused to Mr S, I can't conclude that NatWest needs to do any more than it has already done.

My final decision

My decision is that I do not uphold this complaint, meaning that I don't think that NatWest needs to do anything different to resolve the complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr S to accept or reject my decision before 10 February 2026.

Amanda Williams
Ombudsman