

## **Complaint**

Mr P has complained about a loan AvantCredit of UK, LLC (“Avant Credit”) provided to her. He says the loan was provided at a time when he was already struggling and was therefore unaffordable.

## **Background**

Avant Credit provided Mr P with a loan for £8,300.00 in December 2015. This loan was due to be repaid in 60 monthly instalments of around £220.

One of our adjudicators reviewed Mr P’s complaint and he thought Avant Credit shouldn’t have provided Mr P with this loan. So he thought that Mr P’s complaint should be upheld. Avant Credit didn’t respond so the case was passed to an ombudsman for a final decision.

## **My findings**

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

We’ve explained how we handle complaints about unaffordable and irresponsible lending on our website. And I’ve used this approach to help me decide Mr P’s complaint. Having carefully considered everything I’ve decided to uphold Mr P’s complaint. I’ll explain why in a little more detail.

Avant Credit needed to make sure it didn’t lend irresponsibly. In practice, what this means is Avant Credit needed to carry out proportionate checks to be able to understand whether Mr P could afford to repay any credit it provided. Our website sets out what we typically think about when deciding whether a lender’s checks were proportionate. Generally, we think it’s reasonable for a lender’s checks to be less thorough – in terms of how much information it gathers and what it does to verify it – in the early stages of a lending relationship.

But we might think it needed to do more if, for example, a borrower’s income was low or the amount lent was high. And the longer the lending relationship goes on, the greater the risk of it becoming unsustainable and the borrower experiencing financial difficulty. So we’d expect a lender to be able to show that it didn’t continue to lend to a customer irresponsibly.

Despite being provided with an extended period of time to do so, Avant Credit hasn’t provided anything at all about the checks it carried out before it provided Mr P with this loan. I find Avant Credit’s lack of a response and its apparent disregard of its DISP 1 obligations to be extremely disappointing. Nonetheless, I’ve looked at the information Mr P has provided about his circumstances at the time in an attempt to decide what I think reasonable and proportionate checks are more likely than not to have shown Avant Credit.

I think reasonable and proportionate checks are likely to have involved finding out about Mr P’s income and, at least some of, his expenditure. The information Mr P has provided suggested that he was in a cycle of payday and other high-cost lending. Indeed, I can see at

least a loan a month, from one particular well-known payday lender, in the period leading up to this application.

So I'm persuaded by what Mr P has said about already being in a difficult financial position at the time. And while it's possible he could have been taking these loans through choice rather than because he was struggling, in the absence of any reasonable or plausible arguments from Avant Credit, I've been persuaded to accept Mr P's version of events.

As this is the case, I do think that Mr P's existing debts meant that he was unlikely to be able to afford the payments to this loan, without undue difficulty or borrowing further. And as reasonable and proportionate checks should have extended into finding out about Mr P's income and expenditure, I'm satisfied that they would more likely than not have shown Avant Credit that it shouldn't have provided this loan to Mr P. As Avant Credit provided Mr P with this loan, notwithstanding this, I'm satisfied it failed to act fairly and reasonably towards him.

Mr P ended up paying interest, fees and charges on a loan he shouldn't have been provided with. So I'm satisfied that Mr P lost out because of what Avant Credit did wrong and that it should put things right.

### **Fair compensation - what Avant Credit needs to do to put things right for Mr P**

Having thought about everything, Avant Credit should put things right for Mr P by:

- refunding all interest, fees and charges Mr P paid on this loan;
- adding interest at 8% per year simple on any refunded amounts from the date they were paid by Mr P to the date of settlement†;
- removing any adverse information recorded on Mr P's credit file as a result of this loan;

### **My final decision**

For the reasons I've explained, I'm upholding Mr P's complaint. AvantCredit of UK, LLC should put things right in the way I've set out above.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr P to accept or reject my decision before 4 April 2022.

Jeshen Narayanan  
**Ombudsman**