

complaint

Mr T complains that Lowell Portfolio I Ltd continued to report a default that should not have been registered.

background

Mr T's debt with another lender was bought by Lowell in June 2015. Mr T says that in July and August 2015 he was in contact with the original lender and had promised to pay off the debt by the end of August.

Mr T later repaid the debt by three lump sum payments, beginning in August 2015. He later noticed that both Lowell and the original lender were reporting the default. After he raised the matter with both lenders, the original lender removed its duplicated reporting. Lowell apologised to Mr T and sent him £50.

Mr T felt that, given his approach to the original lender in 2015, the default should not have been registered at all and the account should not have been sold. He brought his complaint to this service, where one of our investigators looked into it.

From the evidence, the investigator concluded that Mr T's credit file showed the correct information and that Lowell had been entitled to carry over the original default registration when it bought the account.

Mr T did not agree, and asked for his complaint to be reviewed.

my findings

I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

This complaint is about Lowell, and this final decision relates only to acts and omissions of Lowell. Mr T has complained separately about his original lender, and that complaint is the subject of a separate final decision.

Lowell bought Mr T's account at the end of June 2015, at which point the account had been in default for about a year and the default had been registered by the original lender a month earlier.

What should have happened at that point is that, on transfer of the account to Lowell, the original lender would discontinue reporting the default and Lowell would take over reporting it as the new owner.

What actually happened is that, for a period of time, both lenders were reporting the same default. So there was duplication – but that does not mean Lowell should not have reported the default.

Mr T has now repaid the debt in full. Lowell is correctly reporting the debt as satisfied, to reflect that. However, this does not mean Lowell must remove now the default altogether. And updating the registration again will not change the information within in. Taking everything into account, I find that Lowell has not done anything wrong in relation to the default.

Mr T has recently raised a new matter, concerning a discount that he says Lowell offered him in a letter but did not then give him. As this new matter was not included in his original complaint, I cannot determine it in this final decision.

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 T to accept or reject my decision before 13 February 2017.

Jane Hingston
ombudsman