

The complaint

Miss K complains that Stellantis Financial Services UK Limited (“SFS”) incorrectly recorded a missed car finance payment which has negatively impacted her credit file.

When I refer to what Miss K said and what SFS said, it should also be taken to include things said on their behalf.

What happened

In June 2024, at the end of a four-year lease agreement, Miss K returned the car for which SFS had provided the finance. After she paid the charges for some minor repairs, SFS told Miss K that the agreement was settled in full and there was nothing further to pay.

In September 2024, Miss K experienced problems during the final stages of her mortgage application. She became aware that SFS had recorded a missed/late payment of just under £5,000 on her credit file which led to her mortgage application being rejected. SFS confirmed that the agreement had been settled and arranged for the incorrect credit file entry to be removed.

In May 2025, Miss K complained to SFS. She said that its mistake had caused her distress and inconvenience, and she had almost lost the house she was in the process of buying. SFS didn’t respond to Miss K’s complaint. After eight weeks, she brought the complaint to us.

Our investigator asked SFS for its comments on Miss K’s complaint. It accepted that it had made a mistake recording a missed/late payment and, by way of apology, SFS offered £200 for the distress and inconvenience Miss K experienced.

Our investigator thought the offer was fair, but Miss K disagreed. She said she’d spent over 20 hours trying to sort out SFS’s mistake which had caused her mortgage application to be rejected. Miss K explained that she’d sent numerous emails, made phone calls, and eventually her credit file was corrected. But she said her house purchase was delayed by a week and she experienced distress caused by SFS’s mistake. Miss K referred to SFS’s and the mortgage company’s administration charges, and said she didn’t think that £200 compensation was enough.

Because Miss K didn’t agree with our investigator’s view, the complaint was passed to me to decide.

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.

Having done so, I’ve decided to uphold Miss K’s complaint. However, while I realise this will come as a disappointment to her, I’m not asking SFS to increase its compensation offer.

There's no dispute that Miss K settled the finance agreement appropriately at the end of the term, or that SFS incorrectly recorded a missed/late payment which had an adverse effect on Miss K's credit file. Both parties also confirmed that Miss K's credit file was corrected. Therefore, I'm satisfied that I don't need to require SFS to take action to put things right. What remains for me to consider is whether SFS's more recent offer of compensation is fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

Although I haven't seen evidence that Miss K's mortgage and house purchase was delayed by about a week solely because of SFS's mistake, I have no reason to doubt her submission. Therefore, I accept that Miss K would likely have experienced the distress and inconvenience she described.

In recognition of the time Miss K spent making calls, and contacting various businesses to try to get her credit file corrected, and in recognition of the distress its mistake caused, SFS offered £200. Miss K doesn't think the offer is good enough.

I've thought carefully about the specific concerns Miss K had, including almost losing the house she was in the process of buying and the fees she'd already paid towards the purchase. I can understand that Miss K would've had concerns at an already stressful time. However, I must take into consideration the fact that SFS didn't dispute its error and it confirmed straight away that it would arrange to correct the records. The evidence of email communication between Miss K and SFS shows that it confirmed the file had been corrected in no more than four days. Therefore, I find that SFS handled the matter promptly.

While Miss K said she almost lost the house, I can't reasonably ask SFS to pay compensation for what might've happened or what almost happened. I haven't seen any evidence that SFS caused any financial detriment to Miss K, so any compensation is purely to address the distress and inconvenience its mistake caused. SFS offered £200 after Miss K brought her complaint to our service. I'm satisfied that its offer is in line with this service's published approach to compensation. I'm also satisfied that it's along the lines of what I would've required had SFS not already made the offer. That's because SFS acknowledged its mistake immediately, and the evidence suggests the impact on Miss K was relatively short-lived and with no significant financial detriment.

So, for these reasons, I uphold Miss K's complaint but I don't think that SFS needs to pay any more than it has already offered.

My final decision

For the reasons explained, I uphold Miss K's complaint and, if it hasn't already done so, I direct Stellantis Financial Services UK Limited to:

- pay Miss K £200 compensation for the distress and inconvenience caused by the incorrect record on her credit file relating to her settled lease agreement.

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

Debra Vaughan
Ombudsman