

## **The complaint**

Mr D complains that Currensea Limited trading as buildmycreditscore.com unfairly recorded adverse information against his credit file in connection with a debit card.

## **What happened**

Mr D held a debit card with Currensea. The card is marketed by Currensea as being able to connect with all major banks. In essence, how it works is, the card allows Mr D to spend up to a set amount each day, following which, payments are then taken by direct debit from his main bank account.

In early 2024 a number of payments were made by Mr D using his card. However, when the direct debits were called for to recover the funds spent, they didn't go through. Further attempts were made to take the payments, and some of the funds were eventually collected, but a payment for £19.50 in May 2024 remained outstanding as unpaid. So, in line with the account terms, Currensea applied a charge to the account - along with some additional interest - and recorded a late payment with credit reference agencies. The arrears were not caught up, so the missed payment continued to be recorded for a number of months.

In late 2025, Mr D complained. He said that Currensea were not a lender, and therefore they had no right to report adverse markers to credit reference agencies. He also said that Currensea had failed to take into account his mental health issues and said that more should have been done to support him as a vulnerable consumer.

Currensea responded. They thanked Mr D for making them aware of his vulnerabilities, and said that had they been aware earlier, they could have provided him with further support through their vulnerability team. They explained that their terms set out that any late or outstanding payments may be reported to credit reference agencies. But having now reviewed his debt, taking into account the vulnerabilities they were made aware of, they agreed to write off his outstanding balance; which included the principal, the late payment fee, and the interest accrued - and they explained that his account would be closed. They said that while the debt had been written off, they were still obliged to report adverse information in respect of the missed payments. Unhappy with Currensea's response, Mr D brought his complaint to our service.

An investigator considered Mr D's complaint but was satisfied the FCA register confirmed they had permission to carry out the above activities, and that it was set out in the terms and conditions of his account – that Mr D was bound by – that they would report any late or missed payments to CRAs. So, he didn't recommend the complaint was upheld.

But Mr D remained unhappy. So, as the parties remain in disagreement, the case 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.

While I know this will come as a disappointment to Mr D, I agree with the investigator here for broadly the same reasons.

It's important to set out to begin with, that the debt owed is not in dispute. Currensea have set out what was owed, and Mr D has himself said that his dispute is not about the factual accuracy of the missed payments. He has focussed however, both initially, and in response to the view, that he feels the adverse information reported to CRAs is not proportionate, and that they have failed to take into account his vulnerabilities. He's also said that Currensea should not be able to report adverse information as it's his money that gets used when making payments, not theirs.

Addressing Mr D's last point first, I'm afraid I don't see things the same way. While Mr D's main bank account is accessed to ensure a sufficient available balance at the time the payments are authorised, the money is then taken from his bank after the payments are made, rather than directly leaving his bank account at the time of the transactions. So, at the time of the transactions, I'm not persuaded that it is Mr D's money that is used.

Equally, in this case, Mr D himself has not disputed that money was owed to Currensea, which I think shows clearly, that it was not Mr D's money that was used initially to make the payment in May. Furthermore, even putting aside whether Currensea were or weren't providing a lending facility, credit reporting is used by a number of different providers, not just creditors, but also utilities providers for instance, along with other third-parties, to record a wide array of information – such as voters roll data. There is no requirement for Currensea to be registered specifically as a lender in order for information to be reported to CRAs. In this case, I'm satisfied that Currensea's terms make it clear that information will be reported to CRAs, and that they have permission to carry out the above activities.

Looking at the number of payments reported against Mr D's credit file, he feels that 18 late payments being recorded is disproportionate to the circumstances. While I understand Mr D's point here, his debit card was used to purchase goods totalling £19.50 in May 2024, and it wasn't until 19 months later, in Currensea's final response letter (FRL), that they agreed to write off his outstanding balance. The credit file provided by Mr D shows 7 missed payments in 2024, and 10 in 2025. This suggests that the arrears were reported from the month following the missed payment in May 2024, and continued to be reported until October 2025, which is the most recent data included in the credit file Mr D has provided, and it would appear this continued for the two months that followed.

Given Currensea chose to write off the amount outstanding in December 2025, some 19 months after the arrears accrued, I'm satisfied that the level of arrears reported to CRAs correlates with the time his account remained in arrears. So therefore, I'm not persuaded Currensea treated Mr D unfairly or reported inaccurate information to CRAs based on the evidence I've been provided.

Turning finally to Mr D's vulnerabilities, I'd like to thank him for sharing this information with our service. I understand that this issue must be difficult for him, and that in attempting to resolve this matter, it would have likely caused him a lot of stress.

Mr D has rightly pointed out that businesses have an obligation to treat customers fairly and take into account a customer's vulnerabilities when looking at the outcomes they deliver. In this case, I can see that at the point Mr D raised his concerns, despite still having an outstanding arrears balance that had not been cleared for a considerable time, Currensea advised us that they took account of Mr D's vulnerabilities, and made the decision to write off the outstanding balance owed, something they were not required to do. I think this shows

that Currensea have taken into account Mr D's vulnerabilities and went beyond what was required of them in choosing to write off his debt. So, I'm satisfied they treated Mr D fairly.

While I appreciate Mr D feels that the adverse information reported should also be removed from his credit file, Currensea have a responsibility to report factually accurate information to CRAs. So, while I'm satisfied they acted reasonably in taking extra steps to extinguish the debt that was owed, given the above requirements I have set out, and the fact the debt wasn't written off as a result of any wrongdoing on Currensea's part, ultimately, I don't think it was unreasonable for Currensea to report this information to CRAs, as I'm satisfied it was an accurate reflection of what happened at the time.

So, while I appreciate this may come as a disappointment to Mr D, I'm satisfied that it was not unreasonable for Currensea to take the actions they did, and for these reasons, I won't be asking them to do anything further here.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I do not uphold Mr D's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr D to accept or reject my decision before 18 February 2026.

Brad McIlquham  
**Ombudsman**