

complaint

Mr M complains about the way Capquest Debt Recovery Limited has dealt with queries he had on his account.

background

Mr M opened a store account in the 1996. He says he last used it in 2001. The balance in this account was sold to Capquest in June 2013, and it managed the debt until July 2014.

In 2013 Mr M received a letter from Capquest which said he had a balance of £1,211.27 on his account. Mr M disputed this and asked Capquest to explain this level of debt. It asked the debt holder but it only had records from 2005 and so could only give purchases on it since that date. PPI cover had however been added to the balance. Capquest put collection activity on hold while it looked into the level of debt with the original account holder. The debt was passed back to the original debt owner in July 2014.

Mr M was unhappy with the way Capquest had dealt with his queries over how the level of debt had accrued. He brought a complaint to us to consider.

The adjudicator did not recommend that the complaint should be upheld. She considered that Capquest had dealt appropriately with the questions it had received from Mr M about the level of debt he was being asked to repay.

Mr M is not happy to accept the adjudicator's recommendation. He says, in summary that the sum Capquest asked him to repay was excessive. It never justified this amount. Further Capquest added interest to the balance. It could not give details of how the balance was calculated and whether any additional cards were used on the account. Finally we should be able to look at the actions of all the businesses that have managed the debt.

The adjudicator responded to say that all Mr M's queries were passed from Capquest to the original account holder. Capquest did not add interest to the debt. It told Mr M that no other cards were used on the account.

my findings

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 have come to the same conclusions as the adjudicator did for much the same reasons. I find that Capquest contacted the original debt owner when Mr M queried the balance. It passed on the information given to it to Mr M regarding the balance and how it had accumulated.

I am not persuaded that the sum Mr M was asked to repay was excessive. The debt had been outstanding for some time and it was fair that Capquest took action to try and recover it when it bought the debt. I note that the balance has reduced as the debt owner has refunded some interest and insurance payments.

Capquest did not add interest to the balance in the year it managed the debt. Further it put collection activity on hold while it discussed Mr M's queries with the original debt owner.

Overall I find that Capquest dealt fairly with Mr M when it managed his debt for a thirteen month period.

I note that Mr M has brought complaints to us regarding other parties who have also managed this debt. His concerns against them have already been considered by us and Mr M is aware of our conclusions in these complaints.

my final decision

For the reasons I have explained, my decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr M to accept or reject my decision before 18 April 2016.

Rosemary Lloyd
ombudsman