

## **The complaint**

C, a limited company complains that Advanced Payment Solutions Limited trading as Cashplus delayed releasing funds paid in to its Cashplus account.

C wants Cashplus to pay interest on the money together with compensation.

C is represented in its complaint by a director of C, Mr C.

## **What happened**

In May 2023, a large payment was made to C's Cashplus account from another bank. Cashplus sent Mr C a text asking him to make contact and he was then asked to submit documents to support the payment.

Cashplus didn't confirm that it had received the documents so Mr C called again and was told that the review of the payment would take four to eight hours. Another member of staff then told Mr C that the documents would be reviewed within 48 hours. This was followed by further contact during which Mr C was told it could take up to five days to review the documents.

When Mr C complained to the Financial Ombudsman Service he was unhappy that Cashplus failed to provide accurate information and did not discuss C's complaint by telephone.

Mr C wanted Cashplus to pay interest on the money it withheld together with £200 compensation for the inconvenience and stress caused.

Our investigator explained that the payment credited C's account on 30 May 2023 and was released on 2 June 2023 after Cashplus concluded its checks. She thought the terms of the Cashplus account allowed checks to be carried out when a payment is received. So, she didn't think it fair to require Cashplus to pay interest on the money received as it was made available within a reasonable timeframe.

Our investigator did think that there had been some confusion over the timescales and complaint responses that Cashplus gave to Mr C. She thought it would have been better for Cashplus to have explained to Mr C that the reason he didn't receive any further correspondence was because it had decided additional checks weren't necessary. Our investigator thought it fair to require Cashplus to pay £100 compensation.

Mr C said the level of award was disappointing because of the mistakes made by Cashplus, the failure by the complaints team to call him to discuss its findings and the fact he felt it necessary to complain to our service.

Our investigator responded to say that some of Mr C's frustrations relate to the way that Cashplus handled C's complaint and that our service can't consider complaints about complaint handling itself.

Mr C then said that he would accept our investigator's recommendation if her view remained

the same after speaking to Cashplus.

In early November 2023, Cashplus emailed us to say that it could not locate our investigator's view of 16 October 2023, so our investigator re-sent her view. Cashplus then sent a further email on 27 November 2023 repeating its request for a copy but recalled the request the same day.

As Cashplus has not said whether or not it accepts our investigator's view, the complaint has come to me to make a final 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.

First, I'm aware I've set out the background to this complaint in less detail than the parties and I've done so using my own words. Our rules allow me to take this approach. It simply reflects the informal nature of our service as a free alternative to the courts. If there's something I haven't mentioned, it isn't because I've ignored it. It's just that I'm satisfied I don't need to comment on every individual argument to be able to reach what I think is the right outcome.

I agree with our investigator that Cashplus is allowed to carry out checks on payments that it receives. The evidence provided indicates that the money paid into C's account was made available within a few days, so I can't see there was an unreasonable delay which would lead me to require Cashplus to pay interest on the funds received.

I do think that some of Cashplus' communication with Mr C could have been better. I can see that Mr C as director had to contact Cashplus more than he otherwise should have. I assume that this diverted time away from running the business of C.

I agree that the investigator's suggestion of £100 for the inconvenience caused is fair. It's within the range of an award we might make where the mistake has taken a reasonable amount of effort to resolve. Our approach to awards like this is on our website.

Mr C has asked whether the lack of response from Cashplus should lead to additional compensation because one of his key concerns was around the distress and inconvenience caused by Cashplus's lack of clarity and failure to follow up its final response letter by telephone as requested. I don't want to disappoint Mr C but I don't require Cashplus to pay additional compensation. As our investigator already explained, complaint handling in itself is not a regulated activity which our service can usually consider complaints about. And this complaint is brought by C, a limited company which is its own legal entity. This means I can't consider the stress that Mr C has felt personally.

Overall, I consider an award of £100 is a fair way to resolve C's complaint.

**Putting things right**

To put things right, Advanced Payment Solutions Limited trading as Cashplus should pay C £100.

**My final decision**

My final decision is that I uphold this complaint and direct Advanced Payment Solutions Limited trading as Cashplus to put things right as set out above.

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

Gemma Bowen  
**Ombudsman**