

The complaint

Mrs M has complained Lloyds Bank PLC won't refund her for a cash machine withdrawal that she didn't make.

What happened

Mrs M has held an account with Lloyds for many years. In June 2025 Mrs M went into her Lloyds branch. She'd recently withdrawn £1,200 from another bank and planned to pay £400 into her Lloyds account and £400 into her partner's account.

Mrs M used one of the automated deposit machines at her Lloyds branch to deposit £400 at 13:17. She then realised she may have need of more cash than she initially expected. Mrs M crossed over to one of the cash machines to withdraw some of the cash she'd just deposited. She tried to withdraw £200 at 13:20. This request was turned down as there were insufficient funds in her account.

Mrs M didn't understand why as she'd just deposited £400. She went to speak to a cashier, as the manager wasn't available. She was told she'd already used her card and PIN to withdraw £400 at 13:18 which is why there were insufficient funds. Mrs M disputed this. She immediately asked to view CCTV and was annoyed this was denied to her.

Over the next fortnight, Mrs M pursued her claim with Lloyds. Lloyds immediately refunded £400 as required under the law. After Lloyds conducted their investigation, they confirmed Mrs M must have made this withdrawal. They would be taking back the £400 they'd initially refunded her.

Distressed by this decision, Mrs M brought her complaint to the ombudsman service. She was adamant she'd not made this withdrawal and continued to be upset by Lloyds not reviewing the CCTV evidence.

Our investigator noted the evidence. This showed Mrs M's genuine card and PIN had been used at 13:18 to withdraw £400. She didn't see how anyone other than Mrs M could have done this. She wasn't going to ask Lloyds to refund Mrs M.

Still unhappy, Mrs M has asked an ombudsman to consider her 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.

Having done so, I've reached the same outcome as our investigator. I'll explain why.

Where there is a dispute about what happened, I have based my decision on the balance of probabilities. In other words, on what I consider is most likely to have happened in the light of the evidence.

It's worth stating that I can choose which weight to place on the different types of evidence I

review, including technical evidence, provided by financial institutions along with complainants' persuasive testimony.

When considering what is fair and reasonable, I'm required to take into account: relevant law and regulations; regulators' rules, guidance and standards; codes of practice; and, where appropriate, what I consider to have been good industry practice at the relevant time. In this case the Payment Services Regulations 2017 are relevant as they require financial institutions to show transactions were properly executed.

To help me come to a decision, I've reviewed the evidence Lloyds provided as well as what Mrs M has told us.

I believe Mrs M received the money she requested from the cash machine when she withdrew £400 within the Lloyds branch. I say this because:

- Mrs M's testimony has been consistent throughout that she'd didn't make this withdrawal and made no attempt to withdraw any funds until she tried to take out £200 at 13:20. However, this means that she spent three minutes after depositing £400 at 13:17 whilst immediately realising she needed to take some money back out.
- It's seems absolutely consistent that she would have been able to walk to the other cash machine (as she deposited cash at a machine that was deposit only) and withdraw £400 within a minute of her original deposit. I know Mrs M says she didn't do this but there is no doubt, based on the evidence, her genuine card and PIN were used to make this cash withdrawal. There's nobody else therefore this could have been. This transaction started with the card being inserted into the machine at 13:18:44 and £400 worth of cash was dispensed at 13:19:15.
- Mrs M doesn't dispute trying to withdraw £200 a couple of minutes later. She inserted her card at 13:20:51 and was then told she didn't have sufficient funds. I couldn't initially understand why there was such a delay between the initial withdrawal and this attempt. Lloyds' evidence shows another individual used their card in between the two transactions Mrs M was making so that would account for the slight delay.
- Lloyds' checks show the cash machine balanced and there were no reported errors. I'm satisfied £400 was successfully dispensed at Mrs M's request. The note dispense isn't the heart of Mrs M's dispute. She argues she didn't make this at all. But I'm sorry to say that I don't see how this could have been possible.

I can appreciate Mrs M's concern at the lack of any review of CCTV. Lloyds states this is only viewed by the police in response to a criminal report and they don't permit individuals to view this. I can understand why as that individual would be viewing confidential details of other third parties.

I'm not sure what Mrs M really expects CCTV to show as she doesn't dispute, she went over to the cash machine. CCTV evidence within branch often only shows movements of individuals. This is what I think any CCTV evidence may have shown if Lloyds had retained this to enable future sharing.

I've noted Mrs M's behaviour at the time this happened. She's adamant that she allowed someone in the branch to check that she didn't have this money in her purse. But by her own evidence, she'd recently withdrawn £1,200 from another bank and only deposited £800 into two accounts. This suggests that there was at least £400 remaining in her purse. I'm not sure that someone looking within her bag at a slight distance would be able to identify £800 or £400.

I appreciate Mrs M's sincere testimony about what happened. However, on balance I am more persuaded by the technical evidence and believe that Mrs M did carry out this withdrawal. I won't be asking Lloyds to do anything further.

My final decision

For the reasons given, my final decision is not to uphold Mrs M's complaint Lloyds Bank PLC.

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

Sandra Quinn
Ombudsman