

The complaint

Mr H has expressed dissatisfaction with Schroder Unit Trusts Limited's response to a change of address request.

Mr H has complained of suffering stress, annoyance, upset and inconvenience – as well as wasted time including that taken to complain.

Background

Mr H wrote to Schroder in February 2023 asking for his address to be changed. Schroder wanted documents from Mr H before it would make the change. Mr H complained there was no legal or regulatory justification for this request.

Mr H wrote to Schroder in September 2023 pointing out the address change he had asked Schroder to carry out in February and asking Schroder to reverse this to the former address. Schroder says it was already using his former address, so it took no further action. A month later Mr H complained to Schroder. In its reply Schroder said it should've written to confirm the position and apologised for not doing so.

Mr H notes Schroder upheld his complaint but offered no compensation.

Our investigator considered Mr H's complaint about the response to the September request (we had already considered elsewhere a complaint about Mr H's February request). Having done so, our investigator didn't think Schroder needed to do anything else to put things right.

He said Schroder hadn't changed Mr H's address in response to the February request – and he thought Schroder had made this clear in February and March 2023 - so there wasn't a need to change the address back in September. Also Schroder had apologised for not responding to Mr H's September 2023 letter.

Mr H rejected our investigator's assessment, saying it failed to provide an appropriate or fair and reasonable resolution to his complaint and asking that the matter be referred for an ombudsman's final decision. So, as the matter couldn't be resolved informally, it 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.

Having done so, I've arrived at the same conclusion as our investigator, for broadly the same reasons. I'll explain in brief.

Using financial services takes time and may involve inconvenience, including that associated with making a complaint. It doesn't follow that redress will be due for this, but I can award it if I find that it is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances.

Schroder apologised for not replying to Mr H's September request with confirmation that it

was using and would continue to use the address he was asking it to use. I note that the result was that Mr H chased for an answer a month later to which Schroder then replied.

I've considered what Mr H has said and sent us about the impact of this failing. Having done so, on balance I'm not persuaded this failing caused inconvenience (including that arising from making his complaint to us) or distress such that it would be fair and reasonable to make a money award in Mr H's favour for this. In reaching my view I take into account the apology Schroder has already offered to Mr H in its reply to his complaint.

For the reasons I've given and in light of what I've said above, I do not uphold the complaint or make an award.

My final decision

For the reasons I've given above, I do not uphold the complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr H to accept or reject my decision before 5 April 2024.

Richard Sheridan
Ombudsman