

## **complaint**

Ms K complains that she should have benefited from lower share dealing costs between November 2010 and July 2012 as a result of being a Premier Account holder. Ms K is looking for Lloyds Bank Plc ("Lloyds") to compensate her for the extra costs she says she has incurred.

## **background**

Ms K's complaint was investigated by one of our adjudicators who recommended it should not be upheld. In summary he said that Lloyds made it sufficiently clear to Ms K what she needed to do in order to benefit from lower share dealings costs, which was to provide her share dealing account provider with a promotional code.

Ms K did not accept the adjudicator's findings. Therefore the complaint has been referred to me for a final decision.

## **my findings**

I have considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what is fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

Having done so, I have come to the same conclusions as the adjudicator and for broadly the same reasons.

Ms K upgraded her current account to a Premier Account in November 2010. By upgrading her account Ms K was entitled to a number of benefits, some of which required registration.

Benefits requiring registration included, amongst others, mobile phone insurance and lower share dealing costs. Therefore the benefits requiring registration were not automatically applied.

Lloyds has submitted that all the benefits and registration requirements were detailed in a Premier Banking Welcome Pack and has provided the account opening form that Ms K signed to say that she had received it. I have given careful consideration Ms K's testimony that she did not receive the pack, and I do not doubt that it is anything other than an honest recollection, but the paperwork that has been provided is persuasive contemporaneous evidence.

Therefore I am satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Lloyds provided the necessary documentation for Ms K to understand the benefits of the account and what was required of her.

The welcome pack that Lloyds has provided states that to benefit from lower share dealing costs the account holder needs to quote a code to their share dealing account provider, which Ms K does not dispute she failed to do.

In summary I am satisfied that Ms K was provided with sufficient information for her to understand what was required of her to benefit from lower share dealing costs. Whilst I fully appreciate Ms K's strength of feeling in this matter, I am unable to conclude that Lloyds should be held liable in this instance.

**my final decision**

For the reasons given above, I do not uphold this complaint. I leave it to Ms K to decide whether, on further reflection, she wishes to accept the offer made by Lloyds (if it is still available), and to contact it directly to let it know what she has decided.

Peter Cook  
**ombudsman**