

## The complaint

Mr B complains that Hargreaves Lansdown Asset Management Limited (“HLAM”) showed the wrong yield in one of its fund fact sheets. He says that, if he’d known the correct yield figure, he wouldn’t have invested in the fund. He wants HLAM to pay him the capital and income he says he’s lost through his investment in the fund, and compensation for the time he spent contacting HLAM when it didn’t reply to his emails.

## What happened

The background to this complaint was set out in my earlier provisional decisions. In summary, Mr B has a fund and share account and a stocks and shares ISA account with HLAM. Both are execution only accounts.

HLAM provides an online “fund finder” service, providing its clients with fund factsheets.

In or around November 2023, Mr B was looking to invest in a fund with a high yield. He noticed HLAM’s fact sheet for a fund, which I’ll refer to as “A”, reporting a yield figure of around 13%. Mr B invested in the fund and made further investments in December and January.

In early January he contacted HLAM as he noticed the yield had dropped to 3.7%. He told us he had to chase HLAM several times before it told him that the yield had previously been reported incorrectly. Mr B sold all his units in A and reinvested in funds he already held. He complained, saying that he wouldn’t have invested in A if he’d been given the correct information.

HLAM said the fund information was provided by a third party, who I’ll refer to as “R”. HLAM said R relied on the information supplied to it by A. It wasn’t until the end of 2023, that it became clear to R that a mistake had been made when A updated the yield figure to 3.7%. This was corrected on HLAM’s online platform in early January 2024. Whilst it recognised the error was unfortunate, HLAM said its factsheets, and its terms, make it clear that it can’t be held responsible for incorrect information provided to it by third parties and that it didn’t guarantee that the information was accurate.

Following HLAM’s response to his complaint, Mr B emailed it in March 2024 with further questions. Whilst HLAM acknowledged Mr B’s email, it didn’t reply to him in full until March 2025, after he contacted it again.

Our investigator didn’t recommend that the complaint should be upheld. Mr B didn’t agree so the complaint was passed to me.

*My provisional decision dated 23 February 2026*

Firstly, I set out the limits of our powers. I said:

Before going any further, it’s also important to understand the ombudsman service isn’t the industry regulator. That means we don’t set the rules for financial businesses

or police the industry to make sure those rules are followed. And we don't have the power to fine or punish businesses. These are all issues dealt with by the regulator, the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA). My role is instead to consider individual disputes and reach an outcome I think is fair and reasonable in the particular circumstances of each.

Our powers to consider complaints are set out in the Dispute Resolution section of the Financial Conduct Authority's Handbook. And I am required to apply these rules and can't disregard them. This complaint is only about what HLAM did or didn't do wrong and, if I decide to make an award, it can only be against HLAM. For this reason, I can't investigate A's actions as Mr B would like.

I went onto explain why I was minded to uphold the complaint. In summary I said that, irrespective of any disclaimers, HLAM has regulatory obligations to carry out business with due skill and care, and to ensure its communications are fair, clear and not misleading. So I thought it was fair and reasonable that, in the circumstances, HLAM should accept some responsibility for the accuracy of the information it provided on its own website, regardless of whether it was supplied by third parties or not.

I thought that, after A had corrected the yield figure on, or around 4 November 2023, HLAM should have corrected the yield on its website quicker than it did. And I thought HLAM should calculate the position Mr B would've been in on 25 January 2024 (when he sold A and reinvested in two funds which he already held) if he'd invested in those existing funds during the period 28 November 2023 to 4 January 2024 inclusive, instead of in A. I thought it should add interest to that payment and pay Mr B £150 for the distress and inconvenience caused.

#### *Responses to my first provisional decision*

Mr B said he accepted my provisional decision.

HLAM didn't agree. It said, in summary, that:

- It made reasonable and proportionate attempts to raise concerns regarding potential inaccuracies with R's third-party data provider. The fact sheet was promptly updated as soon as updated information was received.
- A is responsible for providing it, and R, with accurate and up to date data. The correct yield was only reported on 2 January.
- It reasonably relies on third-party data, and it isn't proportionate to suggest that it should independently check all data points directly with fund managers.
- The fact sheet disclaimer is clear that it doesn't accept responsibility for the accuracy of data and that clients must independently check data before making investment decisions.

It also provided evidence of its data feeds on the relevant dates.

#### *My provisional decision dated 19 March 2026*

Having considered the additional information provided by HLAM, I explained I had changed my earlier conclusion and wasn't now minded to uphold the complaint. I explained the reasons why in a second provisional decision. I said:

As I noted in my earlier provisional decision, HLAM's terms and conditions and the factsheets set out that it can't be held responsible for the accuracy of the fact sheets because they are supplied by a third party. But that HLAM must bear some responsibility for the information displayed on its website because of its regulatory obligations to carry out business with due, skill and care, and to ensure its communications are fair, clear and not misleading.

Having reconsidered the evidence, I'm satisfied that HLAM did enough to fulfil these regulatory obligations. I say that because:

It wasn't unreasonable for HLAM to generally rely on the information it obtained from R. And the FCA sets out that a business can rely on others – it says:

*“A firm will be taken to be in compliance with any rule in this sourcebook that requires it to obtain information to the extent it can show it was reasonable for it to rely on information provided to it in writing by another person.”*

[COBS 2.4.6 (2)]

In this case the yield was reported as being more than 10% higher than the correct figure. But I find HLAM took steps to check the information being reported to it, to satisfy itself that it could reasonably rely on that information. I say that because it queried the yield with R on 7 September and 18 October 2023 and received assurance that the yield was being reported correctly. It raised a further query on 21 December 2023 which when R explained it was waiting for the updated yield figure from A and this was fed through to its systems on 2 January.

I think its efforts to check the accuracy of the information were reasonable in the circumstances and I think there's little it could have done differently to change the outcome here, given the volume of data on its platform.

HLAM has provided evidence to show that the correct yield wasn't reported to it until 2 January and this was when the correct yield was reflected in its systems – on the factsheet and in Mr B's account records.

I sympathise with the position in which Mr B finds himself. He relied on the yield information being accurate. But I find that HLAM took reasonable and proportionate action to satisfy itself that it could rely on the data being reported to it and I can't fairly conclude that it should have done anything more.

From what HLAM has told us, it appears that A was reporting the incorrect yield. Mr B invested in A, so he may be eligible to complain directly to it if he wants to pursue this matter further.

### *Responses to my second provisional decision*

HLAM accepted my provisional decision and didn't have any further comments.

Mr B explained why he thought the complaint should be upheld. He said, in summary, that:

- HLAM is one of the largest financial services providers in the UK and its charges are amongst the highest in the industry. In return, he expects the very highest standard, accuracy and professionalism. HLAM hasn't exercised the required due skill and care.

- With modern technology, it's not unreasonable to expect HLAM to thoroughly check all data provided to it by third parties and to raise any queries before that data is published on its website. HLAM is large enough and has enough resource to do more to protect its clients.
- Whilst the information was being checked, HLAM should have excluded the fund from its "fund finder". Or the yield should have been marked as "N/A".
- HLAM took too long to reply and the way it dealt with his complaint fell far short of reasonable expectations. If he hadn't noticed the discrepancy and complained, it would have gone unnoticed by HLAM.

### **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've carefully considered Mr B's response to my second provisional decision. But it hasn't changed my conclusion.

As I explained previously, the ombudsman service isn't the industry regulator. That means I don't have the power to tell HLAM what systems, technology and resources it should have in place. And I don't have the power to tell HLAM how it should treat all customers or how it develops its internal policies and procedures. I can only decide what I think is a fair and reasonable outcome for both parties, considering the particular circumstances of this complaint.

So, whilst I appreciate Mr B's strength of feeling on what systems and procedures he thinks HLAM should have in place, I can't comment on that.

Mr B says HLAM only noticed the discrepancy because he pointed it out. And that HLAM took far too long to reply to him. Mr B emailed HLAM on 3 January, when he noticed the yield had dropped. So the yield had been corrected by HLAM by the time Mr B pointed out the discrepancy. And HLAM would have known, by that stage, that the yield had been wrongly reported because of its communications with R in late December.

HLAM acknowledged Mr B's 3 January email but wanted to investigate further before replying, which I don't think is unreasonable. When Mr B complained, on 23 January, HLAM didn't provide a full response until 19 March. But this met the FCA's eight-week timescale and, by this point, Mr B had taken action to mitigate any losses. So, even if HLAM had replied earlier, I don't think the overall outcome would be any different.

I am sorry that my first provisional decision will have raised Mr B's expectations of a more positive outcome for him. But I am obliged to consider all the evidence and information provided by both parties and I've explained why the information provided by HLAM in response to my first provisional decision led me to change my conclusion. For the reasons set out in my second provisional decision, I find that, in the particular circumstances here, HLAM took reasonable and proportionate action to satisfy itself that it could rely on the data being reported to it, and I can't fairly conclude that it should have done anything more.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr B to accept or reject my decision before 21 April 2026.

Elizabeth Dawes  
**Ombudsman**