

complaint

Mr H complains that Provident Personal Credit Limited did not update his credit file when he paid off his loan with it.

background

Mr H had an account with Provident. He settled it in July 2014. In April 2015, Mr H realised a default for the account was showing on his credit file. He complained to Provident. It agreed a default was still showing in error, and offered £50 compensation for this. Provident took six weeks to amend Mr H's credit file. He chased it several times during this period.

Mr H brought a complaint to us to consider. The adjudicator recommended that the complaint should be upheld. She considered that Provident should pay Mr H £100 for the trouble and upset caused by the delay in correcting the credit file. This is in addition to the £50 it has already offered.

Mr H is not happy to accept the adjudicator's recommendation. He says the sum does not fully compensate him for the stress caused.

Provident does not agree with the adjudicator's recommendation. It says Mr H complained to it on 9 April 2015, and it removed the default on 20 May. It emailed its response to Mr H as requested.

my findings

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

Mr H settled his finance agreement with Provident in July 2014. His credit file should have been amended at this time to reflect this. When Mr H checked his credit record in April 2015, he realised it had not been updated. Provident has agreed that this was a mistake. It has offered to pay Mr H £50 for the trouble and upset this has caused. He says this is not enough to compensate him.

Mr H complained to Provident by email on 6 April. He received an email reply on 9 April which told him he would receive a response within 21 days. This did not happen, so Mr H chased again on 30 April. Provident emailed him on 1 May asking him for information which he had already provided. Mr H gave this again. Provident replied on 6 May telling him it had already responded to his complaint. Mr H had not received this. The final response sent to him was dated 21 May 2015.

The system notes also show that a letter was sent to Mr H at his old address when he had asked for all communication by email.

Like the adjudicator, I consider that Provident did not handle Mr H's complaint as well as it could have done. He did not receive a response as promised within 21 days, and had to resend information which he had already provided.

I consider that Mr H should be compensated for both Provident's failure to update Mr H's credit file in 2014, and the poor customer service he received when he complained. I agree with the adjudicator that £150 is appropriate compensation for the trouble and upset caused

to Mr H. I note that he says this is not enough. Our awards are however generally modest. They are not designed to punish a business.

my final decision

My decision is that I uphold this complaint. In settlement of it, I order Provident Personal Credit Limited to pay Mr H £150.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr H to accept or reject my decision before 19 November 2015.

Rosemary Lloyd
ombudsman