

The complaint

Miss A complains that she was given incorrect information after Metro Bank PLC decided to close her account and that Metro Bank PLC reversed a credit of £798 by mistake which left her overdrawn.

What happened

Miss A had a number of accounts with Metro, including a current account and two savings accounts. In February 2024, Metro decided to close Miss A's accounts. Miss A contacted Metro to discuss this – Metro told her that as her current account was in arrears it couldn't close her accounts at that time. This wasn't correct – Metro could have closed Miss A's savings accounts. A member of the customer service team also transferred Miss A to speak to a manager without warning her that this is what they were doing.

In addition, Miss A disputes that she owed Metro Bank arrears on the account. In late January, Metro had removed £798 from Miss A's account. Metro says this is because it had credited these funds to the account after Miss A disputed a payment which was subsequently refunded by the retailer.

Metro has already paid Miss A £50 compensation for the poor service she'd received.

I sent Miss A my provisional decision on 29 October 2025. I said I didn't think the complaint should be upheld. In summary I said:

- I concluded that Metro was acting in line with the applicable terms and conditions when it closed Miss A's account.
- The statements showed that Miss A had paid £798 to two retailers. The first payment was made on 15 January 2024, and refunded on 16 January 2024. The second payment was also made on 15 January 2024. Miss A disputed these payments. Metro noted that one of the payments had already been returned – but credited Miss A's account with £798 to cover the value of the second one. On 23 January, Miss A received a refund of £798 from the retailer. So Metro deducted £798 as she'd otherwise receive that second refund twice.
- Miss A claimed the second payment in fact was a refund of a payment she'd made from another account with another bank. But based on everything I'd seen, I didn't find this plausible. Two payments for £798 had left Miss A's account and two refunds had been paid back. I wasn't persuaded that the retailer paid a refund for a different, third, purchase into this account: based on what I'd seen, the retailer only pays refunds to the original payment method, and its records showed that the refund related to the payment out of the account with Metro. As such, I thought it was fair for Metro to reverse the credit it paid to Miss A's account – and I didn't think Metro needed to pay this back.
- I'd considered the further points Miss A had raised, but this didn't change my conclusion. I didn't think Metro needed to do more.

Metro has agreed with my conclusion. Miss A has disagreed. I've therefore reviewed the complaint afresh.

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've carefully considered the points Miss A has raised in response to my provisional decision. She says that the key point was that two amounts of £798 were owed to the Metro account. She also questions the accuracy of the information provided by the retailer. Finally, she says that having raised the matter with the retailer she's now received a separate refund of the payment out of her other account.

With this in mind, I cannot say Metro was wrong to reverse the credit of £798: Miss A made two payments of £798 out of the account with Metro, and received refunds of both these amounts from the retailers. When Miss A disputed these payments, Metro paid a further credit of £798 into her account – but then reversed this after Miss A received the second refund. I can't hold Metro responsible if Miss A mistakenly believed that the third payment of £798 related to a purchase she'd made on an unconnected account. Nor can I hold Metro responsible for any failings on the part of the retailer in refunding the payment she made from her other account.

Metro has already paid Miss A £50 to reflect the poor service she's received. This includes the incorrect information she was given about the closure and the service she received during the calls. I've thought about if they need to do more. I accept that things took a long time to sort out. But given Miss A gave Metro an incorrect explanation of what had happened, I can't say this is Metro's fault. In the circumstances, I think Metro has already paid fair compensation for any poor service. I'm not going to tell them to do more.

My final decision

I don't uphold the complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss A to accept or reject my decision before 31 December 2025.

Rebecca Hardman
Ombudsman