

## **complaint**

Mr T complains about delays in The Prudential Assurance Company Limited making a monthly payment to him from his Prudential Retirement Account.

## **background**

Mr T contacted Prudential to arrange for a regular income drawdown from his pension to start in October 2017. The first payment had to be made manually, and was sent in early November. Another payment was correctly paid to Mr T in November. But in December there were problems with the payment. Mr T was initially told he wouldn't receive payment until mid-January. He wasn't happy with this and explained he needed the money for Christmas. Prudential agreed for the payment to be made sooner, but it still wasn't paid until after Christmas, on 28 December, and received by Mr T in early January 2018.

Unhappy with this, Mr T complained to Prudential who initially offered £75 compensation for the trouble this had caused, which it later increased to £175. Mr T thought the amount should be £500 so he referred the complaint to us.

One of our investigators looked into the complaint. He agreed the level of service provided by Prudential wasn't what Mr T should've expected. He thought given the additional stress of not having money available before Christmas, Prudential should increase its compensation payment to £300.

Prudential didn't agree and asked for an ombudsman to review the complaint. So it's been passed to me.

## **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 agree with our investigator, and for the same reasons.

Mr T has told us this is his main source of income. Being without this so close to Christmas, and initially being told he wouldn't receive the funds until mid-January must have been very stressful. Mr T had to complain twice before Prudential agreed to send the funds to him sooner, but they were still not sent until after Christmas, and weren't received by Mr T until the new year. This must've been upsetting for him, and time consuming having to contact Prudential more than once because of its error.

Of course amounts of compensation for stress and upset are subjective. But in this case, I agree with our investigator that £300 is a fair amount given the individual circumstances.

**my final decision**

My final decision is The Prudential Assurance Company Limited should pay Mr T £300 for the distress and inconvenience this matter has caused.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr T to accept or reject my decision before 16 August 2018.

Rob Deadman  
**ombudsman**