

The complaint

Mr L is complaining about Provident Personal Credit Limited (Provident) declining his card payments. He's also complaining that they paid the agreed compensation by cheque instead of bank transfer.

What happened

Mr L called Provident to make a payment to his loan, but the payment didn't go through. Provident told him to contact his bank to check he had enough money for the payment.

Mr L checked with his bank and says he did have enough money in his account. He also tried to pay with a card from a different bank but it didn't go through.

Mr L complained to Provident and they told him the payments hadn't gone through because he didn't have enough money in his bank account.

Our investigator reviewed Mr L's complaint. She said Provident had given him the wrong information about why his payment didn't go through. She thought it was more likely the payments were declined because the card details weren't recorded correctly.

She asked Provident to pay Mr L £30 for the inconvenience of being told the wrong information. She said Provident should use some of the payment to clear the arrears that had built up while Mr L couldn't make a payment. The rest of the compensation would be paid directly to Mr L.

Mr L accepted the investigator's view. Provident sent him a letter saying £30 had been used to reduce his arrears. But Mr L was expecting the rest of the money to be paid to him.

Mr L spoke to our investigator, and she contacted Provident. Provident said they would use £8 to clear the arrears and would pay the rest to Mr L. The investigator asked Mr L for his bank details and gave these to Provident.

Provident sent Mr L a cheque for £22. But Mr L said he was expecting a bank transfer. He also said he'd been expecting Provident to call him but they didn't.

Mr L complained to Provident. They told him to come back to our service.

Another investigator looked at Mr L's complaint. She told him she didn't think Provident had done anything wrong. But Mr L disagreed. So his complaint has been passed to me to decide.

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'm sorry to disappoint Mr L. But I think the compensation Provident have already paid is fair. I'll explain why.

Provident's records don't show why Mr L's payments didn't go through. So they shouldn't have told him it was because he didn't have enough money in his accounts. I think Provident could have checked Mr L's card details were correct, instead of referring him to his bank.

Because of this, the investigator asked Provident to pay Mr L £30, and they agreed. Mr L accepted £30 to resolve his complaint. I think £30 is fair and reflects the inconvenience caused to Mr L.

Mr L's unhappy with how Provident paid the £30 to him. Our investigator asked Mr L for his bank details. So I can understand why he'd expect a bank transfer.

Provident told our investigator they would be sending Mr L a cheque because they were unable to pay by bank transfer. I'm sorry this wasn't passed on to Mr L. I can understand why a bank transfer would have been easier for him. But I don't think Provident have done anything wrong by sending him a cheque.

Mr L also says Provident didn't call him when they said they would. Provident say they tried to call him twice but couldn't get through. So I don't think it would be fair for Provident to pay any more compensation for this.

Overall I don't think Provident have treated Mr L unfairly. He's now received the compensation he agreed to. So I'm not going to ask Provident to do anything else.

My final decision

My final decision is that I uphold Mr L's complaint. But Provident Personal Credit Limited don't need to do anything else because they've already paid Mr L fair compensation.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr L to accept or reject my decision before 14 January 2022.

Helen Sutcliffe
Ombudsman