

The complaint

A limited company I'll refer to as H complains about Paymentsense Limited (trading as Dojo), saying they were directed to reimburse payments for goods, that they've not been able to recover. H is represented by a director, Mr A.

What happened

H had an account with Dojo that allowed them to take card payments. In June 2025 they say they made a sale of goods for £50,000 to a customer. Because of transaction limits on the Dojo account, H's customer paid in five card transactions of £10,000 each, and the goods were delivered to the hotel the customer was staying in.

Dojo flagged these transactions as out of character for the account. They emailed Mr A and requested information on the transactions. He supplied details of the invoices. The day after Mr A spoke to Dojo – and he says he was directed to refund the full amount.

Mr A initially complained to Dojo H had still been charged for the refunded transactions. But Dojo responded to say the charges were valid.

Dissatisfied with this Mr A referred H's complaint to our service. He also said he had not been able to recover the payment from the customer so was at a loss. Our investigator thought the complaint should succeed. He said Dojo's terms allow them to decline transactions or withhold funds for a period to mitigate any risks. But he didn't see Dojo telling H to refund the payments was reasonable. As H hadn't been able to recover these funds, he thought Dojo should reimburse the full amount and add 8% simple interest per annum to this amount. He also suggested Dojo pay H £250 for the inconvenience.

Dojo rejected this. They said they hadn't directed H to refund the transactions, and didn't see they should be liable to reimburse H. As no agreement could be reached the complaint has been 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.

Looking at the history of H's Dojo account, this series of five transactions does stand out as outside the usual activity. So, I don't see it's unreasonable Dojo decided to take a look at the payments more closely – this is in line with both their legal and regulatory obligations, and their own terms. I understand why Dojo may be uncomfortable with the transaction value, and it's reasonable they've chosen to end their relationship with H.

But I'm also broadly satisfied with the information Mr A has supplied about the sales. The payments and his explanation have remained consistent and are backed up by the evidence he's provided. I'm not persuaded there is compelling evidence Mr A or H have done anything untoward.

Under the terms Dojo could have retained the funds for a period to mitigate any risk of chargeback. But here Dojo suggested Mr A refund H's customer. Mr A has said he was directed to do this. Dojo dispute this and say he was also given the option to wait out the chargeback period – although they seem to have quoted a longer period than I would reasonably expect. The call doesn't appear to have been recorded, so I can't say for certain what was discussed. But the notes prior to the call suggest Dojo weren't minded to release the funds to H.

In either eventuality, I don't see that Dojo's suggestion to initiate a refund was appropriate – especially given that the goods had already been delivered, and there was no guarantee the customer would then pay by other means. I'm not persuaded Dojo have treated H fairly.

Mr A has demonstrated that he has attempted to chase payment, and he says he's been unsuccessful. I've seen no compelling evidence that H have been paid another way. So, I'm minded that by following Dojo's suggestion, H is now at a considerable loss. It's reasonable for Dojo to reimburse H – less any fees Dojo would ordinarily charge for these transactions. If H is paid by their customer at some later date, H should return the funds to Dojo.

As H has been without the use of these funds for a considerable period I'm satisfied it's appropriate for Dojo to also pay 8% simple interest per annum on these funds, to represent the loss of use of these funds.

Lastly, I'm satisfied that Dojo's actions have led to inconvenience to H, in having to chase up a customer for payment they should already have received. It would be appropriate for Dojo to pay H £250 compensation to reflect the impact of this.

My final decision

To resolve this complaint Paymentsense Limited must:

- Reimburse H the £50,000, less any fees they would ordinarily charge
- Add 8% simple interest per annum to this amount, from the date the refund was processed to the date of settlement
- Pay H £250 compensation

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask H to accept or reject my decision before 30 May 2026.

Thom Bennett
Ombudsman