

The complaint

Mr C complains about the service provided by Barclays Bank UK PLC trading as Barclaycard after he mistakenly made two credit card payments.

What happened

On 29 February 2024 Mr C made a payment of £250 from his bank account to his Barclaycard credit card. Mr C's explained he thought the payment had been unsuccessful so another was sent for the same amount. Mr C called Barclaycard which confirmed one of the payments had been received. The following day, both payments had cleared onto Mr C's credit card with Barclaycard. When Mr C called Barclaycard he was told the additional payment would be refunded.

Mr C went back to Barclaycard when no refund was received and a complaint was raised. Barclaycard issued a final response on 9 March 2024 and upheld Mr C's complaint. Barclaycard explained that its agent shouldn't have told Mr C the payment would be refunded as the outstanding balance on his credit card was over 90% of the credit limit. Barclaycard also said Mr C should've been given a timescale of six working days to process a refund. Barclays paid Mr C £100, in addition to £25 it had paid during an earlier call.

Barclaycard's final response also said it had complied with Mr C's GDPR request and that it would be sent to him within the standard time limits.

The refund was made on 12 March 2024 and £250 was sent back to Mr C.

Mr C referred his complaint to this service and it was passed to an investigator. They thought Barclaycard had dealt with Mr C's complaint reasonably and paid him a fair level of compensation. The investigator also said Mr C could refer concerns about the way Barclaycard dealt with his GDPR request to the industry regulator, the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO).

Mr C asked to appeal and said the investigator's view didn't reflect the circumstances of his complaint. As Mr C asked to appeal, his complaint was passed to me to make a decision.

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 aware I've summarised the events surrounding this complaint in less detail than the parties involved. No discourtesy is intended by my approach which reflects the informal nature of this service. I want to assure all parties I've read and considered everything on file. I'm satisfied I don't need to comment on every point raised to fairly reach my decision. And if I don't comment on something, it's not because I haven't considered it. It's because I've focused on what I think are the key issues. My approach is in line with the rules we operate under.

When speaking with the investigator about his complaint, Mr C explained that he'd spent several hours on the phone with Barclaycard. And Mr C's explained he needed the funds back to ensure there was sufficient money in his current account to cover bills whilst on holiday. I'd like to assure Mr C I've read everything he's submitted to us and listened to his call with the investigator where he discussed the detail of his complaint. And I've taken everything Mr C's told us into account, along with the information provided by Barclaycard, when deciding how to fairly resolve his complaint.

I think it's fair to start by saying the underlying issue Mr C experienced was caused when two payments were made to Barclaycard instead of one. I'm satisfied that was out of Barclaycard's control. And I'm satisfied there was always going to be some inconvenience to Mr C when trying to resolve the additional payment he'd made and obtain a refund. So whilst I understand this issue took a reasonable amount of time for Mr C to deal with, I haven't been persuaded errors by Barclaycard caused two payments to be made on 29 February 2024.

When Mr C asked for a refund on 1 March 2024 he was told it would be made within two to three working days. Barclaycard's confirmed that information was wrong and that even if Mr C qualified for a refund, he should've been told it would take six working days to process a refund. That means, even if Mr C's request had been approved on 1 March 2024, it would've still taken until around 8 March 2024 to go through. The refund was made to Mr C on 12 March 2024 which was two working days later. So whilst I agree mistakes were made when Mr C first asked for a refund, the overall impact appears to have been a delay of around two working days only. I've taken that into account when considering a fair settlement.

Barclaycard accepts Mr C wasn't given the right information on 1 March 2024 as the account balance at the time wasn't considered by its agent. In normal circumstances, Barclaycard won't refund a payment if the account balance is 90% or more of the available credit limit – which is the situation with Mr C's credit card on 1 March 2024. I agree that the agent Mr C spoke with should've picked this up and warned him there may be difficulties refunding the additional payment he'd made.

I'm please Barclaycard was able to refund the additional payment Mr C made. Barclaycard paid Mr C £25 early on in the process and increased the settlement by paying him a further £100 for the distress and inconvenience caused. I understand Mr C's suggested a settlement of £1,000 to reflect the level of distress and inconvenience caused but I haven't found grounds to make an award of that nature. In my view, the payments totalling £125 Barclaycard has already made more fairly reflect the overall impact of the service and delay in providing the refund to Mr C. To put it another way, the settlement is very much in line with what I would've told Barclaycard to have paid for the distress and inconvenience caused to Mr C if no offer had been made.

As I'm satisfied the payment was refunded to Mr C and Barclaycard has already agreed a settlement that is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances, I'm not telling it to do anything else.

My final decision

My decision is that Barclays Bank UK PLC trading as Barclaycard has already agreed a settlement that is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr C to accept or reject my decision before 11 September 2024.

Marco Manente
Ombudsman