

## **Complaint**

Mrs B has complained that Ikano Bank AB (publ) ("Ikano") rejected her claim against it under Section 75 of the Consumer Credit Act 1974.

## **Background**

Mrs B bought solar panels for her home in 2015. The purchase was funded by a loan from Ikano, and that business is therefore liable for the acts and omissions of the installer under the relevant legislation. In this case, that relates to the installer misleading Mrs B into believing that the panels would be self-funding, which they weren't.

Mrs B's complaint was considered by one of our adjudicators. She thought that the benefits of the panels were mis-represented to Mrs B, and that fair redress would be for the loan to be restructured to effectively make the panels self-funding. This restructure should be based on evidence of the actual performance of the panels, and a number of assumptions on future performance.

Ikano agreed with our adjudicator's view of the complaint and made an offer to settle the complaint. Mrs B (through her representative) declined this offer explaining that redress hadn't been worked out in line with our established approach to these types of cases. Our adjudicator agreed and told Ikano how the redress calculation should be completed but Ikano did not make a revised offer.

As an agreement couldn't be reached, the case was passed to an ombudsman.

## **My findings**

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

Ikano is familiar with all the rules, regulations and good industry practice we consider when looking at complaints of this type, and indeed our well-established approach. So, I don't consider it necessary to set all of that out in this decision.

Having carefully considered everything provided, for the same reasons as those explained by the adjudicator, and as agreed by Ikano, I uphold this case. In brief, that is because the evidence supports the conclusion that a misrepresentation took place and Mrs B was not given clear information to demonstrate that the solar panels would *not* be self-funding and would equate to an additional cost for her.

So, I think that Ikano didn't treat Mrs B fairly and she lost out because of what Ikano did wrong. And this means that it should put things right.

## **Fair compensation – what Ikano needs to do to put things right for Mrs B**

I appreciate Ikano has made an offer to settle this complaint – but this offer is not in line with our established approach to redress in these types of cases. So, I set out below how we expect Ikano to work this out.

I think that it would be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of Mrs B's complaint for Ikano to put things right by recalculating the original loan based on the known and assumed savings and income to Mrs B from the solar panels over the 10 year term of the loan so she pays no more than that, and she keeps the solar panel system, and any future benefits once the loan has ended.

In the event the calculation shows that Mrs B is paying (or has paid) more than she should have Ikano needs to reimburse Mrs B accordingly. Should the calculation show that the misrepresentation has not caused a financial loss, then the calculation should be shared with Mrs B by way of explanation.

If the calculation shows there is a loss, then where the loan is ongoing, I require Ikano to restructure Mrs B's loan. It should recalculate the loan to put Mrs B in a position where the solar panel system is cost neutral over the 10-year loan term.

Normally, by recalculating the loan this way, Mrs B's monthly repayments would reduce, meaning that she would've paid more each month than she should've done resulting in an overpayment balance. And as a consumer would have been deprived of the monthly overpayment, I would expect a business to add 8% simple interest from the date of the overpayment to the date of settlement. So, I think the fairest resolution would be to let Mrs B have the following options as to how she would like her overpayments to be used:

- a) the overpayments are used to reduce the outstanding balance of the loan and she continues to make her current monthly payment resulting in the loan finishing early,
- b) the overpayments are used to reduce the outstanding balance of the loan and she pays a new monthly payment until the end of the loan term,
- c) the overpayments are returned to Mrs B and she continues to make her current monthly payment resulting in her loan finishing early, or
- d) the overpayments are returned to Mrs B and she pays a new monthly payment until the end of the loan term.

If Mrs B accepts my decision, she should indicate on the acceptance form which option she wishes to accept

If Mrs B has settled the loan, Ikano should pay Mrs B the difference between what she paid in total and what the loan should have been under the restructure above, with 8% interest.

If Mrs B has settled the loan by refinancing, Mrs B should supply evidence of the refinance to Ikano, and Ikano should:

1. Refund the extra Mrs B paid each month with the Ikano loan.
2. Add simple interest from the date of each payment until Mrs B receives her refund.
3. Refund the extra Mrs B paid with the refinanced loan.
4. Add simple interest from the date of each payment until Mrs B receives her refund.
5. Pay Mrs B the difference between the amount now owed and the amount she would've owed if the system had been self-funding

I'm satisfied that there was sufficient information available at the time that Mrs B first contacted Ikano that means the claim should have been upheld. I direct that Ikano should pay £100 compensation for the trouble and upset caused.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons I've explained, I'm upholding Mrs B's complaint. Ikano Bank AB (publ) 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 Mrs B to accept or reject my decision before 17 May 2022.

Asma Begum  
**Ombudsman**