

The complaint

Mr L complains Think Money Limited (“Think Money”) treated him unfairly when it wrongly recorded a fraud marker at Cifas. He says this caused him significant trouble and upset and it should compensate him fairly.

What happened

Below is a summary of events.

Mr L found out that Think Money had recorded a fraud marker against him in 2022 for “False Application” in relation to an account application. He complained in August 2025 saying he’d not done anything to cause this.

Think Money investigated and accepted it had made a mistake. It arranged to delete the marker, apologised and offered £100 for the distress and inconvenience caused. After some further engagement with Mr L, it increased its offer to £150. However, it didn’t think it needed to do anymore because it couldn’t be satisfied Mr L had been left unbanked, submitting he’d opened another account with Think Money in 2023, which hadn’t been used¹. Mr L rejected the offer - he didn’t think it fairly reflected the difficulties he’d faced.

Mr L asked our Service to take a look and argued the mistake had affected his ability to access banking services, where his accounts had been closed. He said the whole situation left him feeling distressed.

One of our investigators reviewed the complaint and recommended Think Money should pay Mr L another £100 (so £250 in total) to settle the complaint, because in her view, this was a fairer reflection of the impact the mistake had.

Mr L accepted the suggested outcome, however, Think Money didn’t. It said the available evidence showed Mr L had access to a bank account and the information he’d provided about accounts being closed related to facilities being opened and closed straight away in August 2025. Think Money maintained its offer of £150 was fair.

When the investigator didn’t change her mind, the case was put forward for a decision,

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.

As an informal dispute resolution service, we are tasked with reaching a fair and reasonable conclusion with the minimum of formality. In doing so, it’s not necessary for me to respond to every point made, but to concentrate on what I consider to be the crux of the issue.

Having done so, I’ve decided Think Money should pay Mr L the additional £100 so that he receives £250 in total. I’ll set out the key reason(s) why.

I accept Mr L hasn't provided any supporting evidence of his actual financial loss, but I think it must be recognised by Think Money that the type of fraud marker it recorded was not an insignificant matter. The marker was serious, signalling suspected fraud where this type of loading can and does restrict a customer's access to banking. Whilst the available evidence suggests Mr L had an account after the marker for a period, and it's not entirely clear what else he may have had, I can understand how distressing it would have been for him to discover he'd been loaded onto a national fraud database and wrongly. I'm satisfied the mistake caused Mr L significantly more than frustration and annoyance. It was both upsetting and alarming and was only rectified after he went to a reasonable effort to raise it with Think Money and set out his case.

Considering this, it's only right that Think Money should pay an amount of compensation to reflect all the above. All things considered, I agree with the investigator that £250 in its entirety is fair compensation.

My final decision

My final decision is that Think Money Limited should pay Mr L £100, ensuring he's received £250 to settle this complaint. Think Money Limited will need to check what payments it has already made to Mr L in relation to this.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr L to accept or reject my decision before 25 February 2026.

Sarita Taylor
Ombudsman

ⁱ This account was eventually closed due to dormancy.