

The complaint

Mr M has complained that Laser Credit Union Limited ("Laser") failed to amend his credit file after his Debt Relief Order had come to an end.

What happened

Mr M took out two loans with Laser which led to a debt relief order as a result of the outstanding debt sums. The debt relief order was made in March 2017 and was in relation to two loans.

In or around June 2023 Mr M discovered that the record of the debt hadn't been removed from his credit file. He told Laser who then arranged for Mr M's credit file to be updated.

Mr M doesn't think Laser has done enough and would like additional compensation because of the error and the way he's been treated.

Our investigator didn't uphold the complaint. He said that although he understood Mr M's frustration, Laser acted quickly to amend his credit file as soon as it was aware of the issue.

Mr M disagreed with our investigator's opinion so the complaint has been passed to me.

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.

We've set out our general approach to complaints about short-term lending - including all of the relevant rules, guidance and good industry practice - on our website.

I've seen that Mr M contacted Laser by email on 24 June 2023 to tell them that his credit report showed he still owed money. On 26 June Laser emailed Mr M to confirm that the credit file had been updated to reflect that the loans had been settled for credit reference purposes.

Although the error in not updating Mr M's credit file ought not to have happened in the first place, I am satisfied that Laser acted promptly to bring the file up-to-date as soon as Mr M made them aware.

Mr M considers that he's lost out because of the error and should be compensated. He says it has ruined his credit score and affected his mental health. He has also mentioned that he had difficulty contacting Laser to make them aware of their error. He also refers to a previous incident where he was banned from visiting Laser's premises in person. In any event, the evidence I have seen – including Mr M's email to Laser and their response two days later – shows Mr M was able to contact Laser and that the issue was resolved immediately.

Mr M also says it has taken years to resolve this matter. That might be true if, for example, there was a long history to be seen of Mr M seeking to get his credit file updated but not

meeting with any success. But I haven't seen evidence or information to show or suggest that's the case. And I also haven't seen evidence or information about how Mr M has lost out due to his credit file not being updated. Our investigator has asked Mr M to provide us with any evidence of previous contact with Laser about the issue but he has not been able to do so.

Although I know Mr M would like me to do more, having thought carefully about everything I've seen, I consider that Laser has done enough. I therefore won't be asking Laser to do anything more.

I am sorry to have to disappoint Mr M on this occasion.

My final decision

For the reasons I've set out above, I don't uphold Mr M's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr M to accept or reject my decision before 9 February 2024.

Michael Goldberg
Ombudsman