

The complaint

Mr K has complained that ReAssure Limited didn't provide appropriate assistance when he was attempting to trace a payment it made to him from his pension.

What happened

Mr K had a personal pension with ReAssure. In November 2024, he contacted ReAssure to advise that he wanted to take his full pension early due to ill health. ReAssure requested medical information so that it could consider the claim.

Mr K experienced some delays and complained. He said he was told on 20 January 2025 that the payment would be made on 21 January 2025 but this hadn't been received. And when he called up on 21 January 2025 he was told the payment had already been made when it hadn't. ReAssure issued a final response to Mr K on 28 January 2025. It agreed that it had provided conflicting information and apologised for saying the payment had been made on 21 January 2025 when it hadn't. ReAssure confirmed the payment had been authorised on 23 January 2025. ReAssure offered to pay Mr K £250 for the distress and inconvenience caused.

Mr K telephoned ReAssure to explain that he had only received £200, not the £250 offered. ReAssure made a further payment of £50 to Mr K on 7 February 2025.

Mr K contacted ReAssure in August 2025 saying he wasn't able to trace having received the payment from his pension which was supposed to have been paid in January 2025. ReAssure told Mr K it would review this internally and the payment would be reissued if it hadn't been paid.

On 21 August 2025, ReAssure wrote to Mr K to explain that it had made the payment to him on 23 January 2025 – it suggested he contact his bank if this hadn't been received. Mr K wasn't satisfied with this response and complained. He provided a redacted copy of his bank statement which he said showed the payment hadn't been received.

ReAssure investigated this further and contacted Mr K's bank. ReAssure issued a final response letter on 23 September 2025 explaining that the bank had confirmed the payment had been received into Mr K's bank account on 23 January 2025. It said it couldn't assist Mr K further with this and said he would need to contact his bank to establish the whereabouts of his monies.

Mr K remained unhappy and made a further complaint. ReAssure issued a further final response letter on 21 October 2025, explaining it was satisfied that ReAssure had paid Mr K the proceeds of his pension plan on 23 January 2025 and the payment hadn't been returned to it. ReAssure said Mr K would need to take this up with his bank if the funds couldn't be located. ReAssure said it would not be entering into any further discussions about this issue.

During the course of its investigation, ReAssure sent Mr K correspondence relating to another customer in error. Mr K said this raised concerns about the safety and security of his own personal data. ReAssure apologised, confirming that his personal data hadn't been

shared with any other party. Mr K requested some compensation and ReAssure paid him £300.

Mr K remained unhappy and referred his complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service. He said ReAssure had still failed to trace or release his pension payment, and had ignored numerous emails and calls. He said his medical conditions made him a vulnerable customer and ReAssure had failed to take this into account – it also continued to provide conflicting information about which department was handling the matter. Mr K explained that this had caused him significant distress and inconvenience and he was seeking compensation of ‘£4,000+’.

The Investigator didn’t uphold Mr K’s complaint. He said that ReAssure had verified with Mr K’s bank that the payment had been received on 23 January 2025 and that we had also obtained statements direct from Mr K’s bank showing the payment had been received. The Investigator also noted that Mr K had confirmed that he’d received the payment in a call to ReAssure in February 2025. Ultimately, the Investigator considered that Mr K could’ve contacted his bank directly to clear up any misunderstanding but he chose to continue engaging with ReAssure. He also thought that he’d received fair compensation for the data breach and a further £215, although it wasn’t clear why this had been paid.

Mr K didn’t accept the Investigator’s view. He said that if ReAssure had provided full information to allow him to trace the payment through his bank he wouldn’t have had to escalate matters. Mr K said ReAssure didn’t provide him with any confirmation from his bank that the payment had actually been credited to his account. He said this should have been shared with him from the outset.

The Investigator wasn’t persuaded to change his opinion so the complaint has been passed to me to make 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.

I’d like to start by acknowledging that I’ve been provided with a great deal of comments and evidence in relation to this complaint. And I’d like to reassure both parties that I’ve carefully considered everything provided. But my decision, either in the background or in my findings, won’t set out or address every point made or every piece of evidence. That’s deliberate; while I mean no discourtesy, my decision will instead only set out and address what I see to be relevant in reaching a fair and reasonable outcome to this complaint against ReAssure.

Having considered everything that’s been provided, I’m not upholding Mr K’s complaint. I’ll explain why.

It appears that Mr K now accepts ReAssure paid him the proceeds of his pension policy on 23 January 2025. However, for completeness, I’m satisfied that the payment was made by ReAssure, to the bank account details Mr K provided, on 23 January 2025. And that this has also been confirmed as being received into that account by Mr K’s bank. A statement provided by Mr K’s bank to us directly confirms the funds were credited to his account. I also think that Mr K acknowledged in both a call and email in January 2025 that he had received the funds at the time.

I’ll therefore focus my decision on Mr K’s remaining concerns, namely that ReAssure didn’t provide him with full tracing information or evidence of the contact it had with Mr K’s bank

such that he ought to have been satisfied the payment had been received. And that it failed to respond to his communications about his remaining concerns.

While I appreciate Mr K's strength of feeling on this matter, I'm satisfied that ReAssure responded to Mr K's initial requests and concerns fairly. When he first notified ReAssure that he wasn't able to locate the payment, it checked its internal records and confirmed on 21 August 2025 that it had made the payment. It suggested that Mr K contact his bank if he couldn't locate the funds.

Mr K then provided a copy of his bank statement in support of his position, but ReAssure had concerns about the format and that it had been heavily redacted. It also didn't show the compensation payment of £200 that Mr K had confirmed he received in a phone call on 30 January 2025. In light of the conflicting information, ReAssure sought to investigate things further with Mr K's bank.

ReAssure sent Mr K a final response letter on 23 September 2025 in which it shared with Mr K a screenshot of its correspondence with Mr K's bank – the bank representative confirmed that the funds were credited to the beneficiary details ReAssure had provided (Mr K's bank account) and it provided the reference number. Mr K says that ReAssure should've provided the underlying confirmation from his bank, but I disagree. I think that sharing the correspondence confirming the payment had been received was sufficient.

While Mr K continued to email ReAssure about the payment which he still considered to be missing, I'm satisfied that ReAssure provided a reasonable response and also evidence that Mr K's bank had confirmed the payment had been received. I think it was fair for ReAssure to place greater reliance on this evidence over the statement Mr K had provided. I also think it was reasonable for ReAssure to direct Mr K back to his bank if he still had concerns about the payment being missing. But I haven't seen any evidence to demonstrate that Mr K took the issue up with his bank; instead, he continued to contact ReAssure, but I don't think ReAssure was obliged to do anything more following its response of 23 September 2025.

Nevertheless, I see that ReAssure responded to Mr K again by email on 30 September 2025. ReAssure reiterated that it was satisfied the payment had been made and was received by Mr K's bank. It explained that for ReAssure to be in a position to help further, it would need a letter from Mr K's bank, on its company headed paper, sent to ReAssure directly confirming the payment had not been credited to his account. Alternatively, he was asked to provide a fully visible bank statement sent via post unredacted between 22 January 2025 until at least 13 February 2025.

Based on the evidence I've seen, Mr K didn't provide this evidence and I've seen no evidence from Mr K's bank to demonstrate that the payment had not been received. On the contrary, Mr K's bank provided us with a full statement from 13 January 2025 to 12 February 2025 showing that the payment had been received on 23 January 2025 and that Mr K had proceeded to spend the money thereafter.

I appreciate that Mr K wasn't satisfied with ReAssure's response to his enquiry, but I think it provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it had paid out the proceeds of Mr K's pension policy in January 2025 and that Mr K's bank had confirmed receipt. And I don't think that ReAssure had any obligation to help Mr K with things further. It then unequivocally told Mr K on 21 October 2025, following more correspondence, that it would not enter into any further discussions and that if Mr K remained unhappy he should refer his complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service.

Mr K says that ReAssure failed to respond to him thereafter (though I note it did still tell him it would review unredacted statements should he provide them), but I don't think that was unreasonable in the circumstances.

I note that ReAssure paid Mr K a sum of £215 in October 2025. It isn't clear why this payment was made, but I don't think that ultimately matters here. I'm satisfied that ReAssure dealt with Mr K's enquiry about the pension payment he couldn't locate fairly so I don't think any compensation is warranted.

I also wish to acknowledge that during the investigation of Mr K's complaint, he was sent correspondence relating to another consumer. ReAssure paid Mr K £300 to compensate him for the distress and inconvenience this caused. It doesn't appear that Mr K is still unhappy about this – he made it clear that this related to a separate issue and the compensation paid should not be treated as part of any compensation or redress for the complaint he made about the missing pension payment. So, I'm not considering this further.

My final decision

For the reasons set out above, I'm not upholding this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr K to accept or reject my decision before 14 May 2026.

Hannah Wise
Ombudsman