

The complaint

Mr G complains that Capital One (Europe) plc has given misleading information about his account balance and available amount to spend on his credit card account.

What happened

Mr G says in early February 2023 Capital One recorded his account balance incorrectly. He says between 1 February 2023 and 7 February 2023 his available balance increased by £9 before being reduced by the same amount. Mr G says he asked Capital One for information but didn't receive clear answers. He says he would like compensation for what took place.

Capital One says the transaction for £9 took longer than usual to be correctly processed. It says the process depends on a number of factors and that on this occasion, it seems that the card provider, not it, took slightly longer than usual to complete its part. Capital One says as a result of the delay, it increased Mr G's available balance by £9 before reducing it shortly afterwards.

Mr G brought his complaint to us, and our investigator didn't uphold the complaint. The investigator didn't think Mr G had been disadvantaged by what took place and that there were a number of factors involved in a transaction of this nature. The investigator didn't think in any event there had been a real impact on Mr G.

Mr G doesn't accept that view and says the investigator ought to have spoken to the company he made the transaction to. He says compensation is justified and says Capital One is at fault.

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 have come to the overall view that I don't uphold this complaint. I appreciate Mr G will be disappointed by my decision and appreciate how strongly he feels about what took place.

I am sure Mr G appreciates that any transaction such as this involves a number of different businesses and must follow a process. I can see that Capital One correctly reduced Mr G's available account balance by £9 but later increased it by the same amount when the payment was not taken within the usual time period. I am also satisfied on balance that Capital One correctly reduced the balance again when the payment was taken on 7 February 2023. I appreciate it may have been confusing to see the available balance change in this way and that normally such transactions do not take as long to process.

Capital One has explained that at the time, there was an issue with the card provider and that may explain the slightly longer processing time. I can't fairly hold Capital One responsible for the actions of a third party and think it likely on balance that was the reason for the delay.

I appreciate Mr G says we should speak to the business Mr G made the payment to. But I agree with the investigator that there is no need to do so in circumstances where there is no suggestion it made a mistake.

I'm satisfied that as there was a slight delay in the transaction being processed that Capital One was entitled to increase Mr G's available account balance by £9 for what was a very short time period. I don't think Capital One made a mistake or acted unfairly by doing so. In any event I don't think Mr G suffered any financial impact as a result of what took place and think the increase was a relatively minimal amount of £9. I can't see that compensation is justified here for those reasons.

Overall, I'm satisfied it more likely here that there were external factors outside Capital One's control that led to what I think was a very slight delay in processing a £9 payment. It follows that I can't fairly order Capital One pay compensation or do anything further in the circumstances of this complaint.

My final decision

My final decision is that I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr G to accept or reject my decision before 16 September 2023.

David Singh
Ombudsman