

## **The complaint**

Mrs S complains that she was unable to make payments to her credit card with JaJa Finance Ltd trading as Asda Money Credit Card.

## **What happened**

Mrs S holds an Asda credit card account. In or around January 2025 she found that the payments she made to her account were subsequently refunded. Mrs S was using the payment method she'd always used before without issue. After several attempts Mrs S stopped trying to pay as she thought there must be an issue with her account and that Jaja would get in touch as they could see she was trying to make payments.

Mrs S's account was subsequently defaulted and passed to a debt collection agency.

Mrs S complained to Jaja. She asked them to amend her credit file and allow her to continue paying the card without late fees or charges. She also sought compensation.

Jaja didn't uphold the complaint. It explained that it had made changes to its payment processing system which no longer allowed card payments if there is a mismatch in the name on the debit card and the credit card account, and which no longer allowed payments from business accounts. It said the last successful payment received on Mrs S's account was on 27 January 2025. It said that Mrs S had contacted them via live chat and that the live chat team had suggested alternative payment methods. Jaja said that details of alternative payment options were also included on the monthly statements. Jaja said that because the other payment options were available and the payment processing update had been correctly applied, it was unable to uphold the complaint.

Mrs S remained unhappy and brought her complaint to this service. She felt that she should've been notified of the changes in the payment processing system and says that if she'd been notified, she would've arranged an alternative way to make payments.

Our investigator didn't uphold the complaint. She said that although Jaja should have communicated the change in its payment processing system, it had made Mrs S aware of her responsibility to make payments each month and had provided details of other ways to pay. The investigator said that because Mrs S had been provided with alternative ways to pay but hadn't done so, Jaja hadn't made an error when it defaulted the account.

Mrs S didn't agree so I've been asked to review the complaint.

## **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 know it will disappoint Mrs S, but I agree with the investigator's opinion. I'll explain why.

I've read and considered the whole file, but I'll concentrate my comments on those points which area most relevant to my decision. If I don't mention a specific point, it's not because

I've failed to take it on board and think about it, but because I don't think I need to comment on it in order to reach what I think is the right outcome.

Asda has explained in its final response that Mrs S's payments were returned due to changes in its payment processing system which meant it no longer allowed card payments where there was a difference between the name on the account and the name on the debit card, or where payment was being made from a business account.

As a starting point, I've looked at the terms and conditions of the agreement to see whether Jaja was allowed to make changes to its payment processing system. Sections 9.2 and 9.4 are relevant and state that Jaja can make changes to its processes for a number of reasons.

Based on what I've seen, I'm satisfied that Jaja acted within the terms and conditions when it made the changes.

I've gone on to consider whether Jaja was obliged to notify Mrs S about the changes to its payment processing system. Section 9.6 states that Jaja will tell cardholders about any changes by communicating this via the statements or by notice via email or the app or text message.

This service asked Jaja whether it communicated the changes in its payment processing system and it confirmed that it didn't. So I've gone on to consider whether Jaja met its responsibilities under the Consumer Duty rules. These rules require lenders to support consumers with a product or service after the point of inception.

In Mrs S's case, the Consumer Duty requirement to prevent customers from foreseeable harm means that it should have communicated the changes to the payment processing system.

Based on what I've seen I'm persuaded that Jaja failed to meet its responsibilities under the Consumer Duty. So I now need to consider whether that the changes to the payment processing system and the failure to communicate these changes meant that Mrs S wasn't able to meet her obligations under the credit card agreement.

I've reviewed the relevant parts of the credit card agreement. The terms and conditions require Mrs S to make a minimum payment by the due date each month. The agreement states that fees and charges will apply if payments aren't made on time.

I can see that online statements were sent to Mrs S every month. The statements include a section titled "Ways To Pay" and several different ways to pay are set out. These include direct debit, via the app, via bank transfer and via debit card via the web.

I can also see that Jaja sent minimum payment reminders and missed payment notifications to Mrs S every month after her last successful payment was made in January 2025. These reminders also included details of the ways to make payment.

I can also see that Mrs S contacted Jaja via live chat several times and was advised on at least two occasions to try other payment methods.

Whilst I acknowledge that Mrs S wasn't aware of the specific reason why her payments weren't successful at this time. I'm persuaded that she was aware that her payments hadn't been successful and that she was in breach of her obligation to make the minimum payment to her account by the due date. I'm also persuaded that Jaja took reasonable steps to make Mrs S aware of all available ways to pay. I haven't seen any evidence to suggest that Mrs S tried to make payment by some other method even though she was aware that her attempt

to pay via the app had failed and even though she had been advised via live chat to try a different way to pay.

In the circumstances, I'm not persuaded that the changes to the payment processing system or the failure by Jaja to communicate these changes prevented Mrs S from meeting her obligations under the credit agreement.

I can see that the account was defaulted in July 2025 and that the default has been registered with the credit reference agencies. Mrs S has explained that this is causing her difficulty with a renewal of her mortgage. I've thought about whether Jaja made an error when it defaulted the account, but I don't think it did. I say this because the account had fallen into significant arrears by the time it was defaulted. The Information Commissioners Office guidelines say that a lender may default an account where there are three months arrears and that a lender should default an account where the arrears reach six months. In Mrs S's case the arrears had reached six months. Further, Jaja – like all lenders – is obliged to report accurate information to the credit reference agencies. I'm satisfied that Jaja didn't make an error when it defaulted the account and that the account has been correctly reported as defaulted. So, I won't be asking Jaja to amend Mrs S's credit file.

Finally, I've thought about whether Jaja has acted unfairly or unreasonably in some other way, given the nature of the complaint. I've had regard in particular to whether Mrs S's relationship with Jaja could be said to be unfair under section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act. But for the reasons I've set out above, I'm not persuaded that this is the case.

Taking all of the available information into account, and for the reasons I've explained, I won't be asking Jaja to do anything further.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I don't uphold the complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs S to accept or reject my decision before 3 March 2026.

Emma Davy  
**Ombudsman**