



30 March 2026

Final report by the Complaints Commissioner

Complaint number 202500621

The complaint

1. You submitted a complaint to my office about the FCA on 01 January 2026 and further related emails through to 04 March 2026.
2. Your complaint relates to a matter which I have previously considered under the Complaints Scheme in report 202500218¹. I refer to and repeat the Preliminary Points set out in my final report in that case (at paragraphs of 4 – 7). This complaint follows earlier correspondence between you and Firm X concerning the possible existence of a bank account held by your late father.
3. The background to that matter was considered previously and is not repeated here in full. In summary, you had asked Firm X to confirm whether it held an account in your father's name. Firm X had previously informed you that it had been unable to identify such an account.
4. More recently, Firm X agreed to undertake a further search of its records in response to your continued enquiries. You say that Firm X advised you it would carry out this additional search but did not provide an outcome for over eight weeks.
5. You remain dissatisfied as you say you are still awaiting a substantive response from Firm X following that further search. You have complained to the Financial Ombudsman Service (the "FOS") but you explain it did not review your complaint on jurisdictional grounds.

¹ <https://frccommissioner.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/202500218-Issued-24-September-2025.-Published-16-October-2025.pdf>
202500621

6. I understand that the crux of your current complaint against the FCA to be:
- a. **Element 1:** You allege that the FCA has failed to supervise Firm X by not taking action against it in respect of your assertions that Firm X has not complied with its obligations to you under DISP 1.6.2R (i.e. to provide you with the outcome of its search within an eight week timeframe), has misled the FOS and is participating in a cross-border fraud.

Outcome: Not upheld.

- b. **Element 2:** You allege that the FCA has wrongly treated your current complaint as a continuation of your previous complaint, instead of as a standalone complaint about Firm X's alleged failure to comply with DISP 1.6.2R.

Outcome: Not upheld.

Analysis

Element 1: You allege that the FCA has failed to supervise Firm X by not taking action against it in respect of your assertions that Firm X has not complied with its obligations to you under DISP 1.6.2R (i.e. to provide you with the outcome of its search within an eight week timeframe), has misled the FOS and is participating in a cross-border fraud.

7. I consider that the only key development since your previous complaint to me is that Firm X has not responded within 8 weeks to your request for information about a bank account which you believe belonged to your late father and you consider that the FCA has failed to assess this conduct by Firm X.
8. The FCA declined to investigate your complaint because it was not related to its relevant functions. It told you that it does not intervene in disputes between individuals and their services providers, as that is the role of the FOS. The FCA Supervision Hub had previously explained to you that it had logged the information you had provided in accordance with its procedures for the FCA's Supervision Team to take into account in its work as appropriate, however, it would not be able to tell you what actions, if any, it took due to confidentiality restrictions. In my view, the FCA was correct to take this approach, and it has handled the information you provided appropriately. This is a personal dispute

between you and Firm X and the FCA is justified in its decision not to investigate this part of your complaint to it and to inform you that it remains open to you to seek independent legal advice about your dissatisfaction with Firm X.

9. In any event, the eight-week timeframe set out in DISP 1.6.2R relates to complaints against a firm. Firm X has not been asked by you to investigate a complaint against it, but rather to re-investigate whether it holds an account in your late father's name. Therefore, DISP 1.6.2R does not apply to your request to Firm X to re-investigate if it holds an account in your late father's name.
10. You have stated to the OCC that your complaint about the FCA is also about suspected international bank fraud, however, this allegation was reviewed in complaint 202500218 and I will not be revisiting a concluded matter in the absence of new evidence. In any event, the information you provided was passed onto and received by the relevant Supervision Team for its consideration in accordance with FCA internal procedures.
11. Therefore, I do not uphold your complaint.

Element 2: You allege that the FCA has wrongly treated your current complaint as a continuation of your previous complaint, instead of as a standalone complaint about Firm X's alleged failure to comply with DISP 1.6.2R.

12. I do not agree that the FCA has conflated your current and previous points of complaint.
13. The FCA's Decision Letter in your current complaint expressly (i) references your new allegations about Firm X's delay in providing you with the information you request and (ii) explains that this is a complaint about the actions of an individual firm and not about the FCA. I agree with the FCA's analysis. Additionally, the FCA passed the information you provided to it onto the relevant FCA teams in accordance with its procedures.
14. Therefore, I **do not uphold** this point.

The Complaints Commissioner

Complaints Commissioner

30 March 2026