

The complaint

Mr L has complained about Creation Consumer Finance Ltd's ('Creation') response to a claim he made under Section 75 ('s.75') of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 (the 'CCA') and in relation to allegations of an unfair relationship taking in to account Section 140.A ('s.140A') of the CCA.

Mr L has been represented in bringing his complaint but, to keep things simple, I'll refer to Mr L throughout.

What happened

On 9 March 2015, Mr L bought a solar panel system ('the system') from a company I'll call "M" using a 10-year fixed sum loan from Creation. The loan was for £8,440 and the monthly repayments were £110.85 for 120 months.

Mr L complained to Creation, he said that he was told by M that the 'feed in tariff' ('FIT') payments and savings he would make would cover the cost of the loan repayments, however that hasn't happened, and he's suffered a financial loss. He also believed that what happened at the time of the sale created an unfair relationship between himself and Creation.

Mr L raised his complaint to Creation on 22 March 2022. Creation issued a final response letter dated 24 May 2022. Creation considered Mr L had brought his claim more than six years after the cause of action occurred under the FCA's rules on dispute resolution and later Creation said the complaint that for the same reason they had no obligation under section 75 of the CCA. Unhappy with Creation's response, Mr L asked us to review his complaint. Mr L brought his complaint to this service on 8 June 2022.

An investigator considered Mr L's complaint, she ultimately thought that -

- Given the s.75 claim was more likely to be time barred under the Limitation Act ('LA'), Creation's answer seemed fair.
- The s.140A complaint was one we could look at under our rules and that it had been referred in time.
- Misrepresentations could be considered under s.140A.
- A court would likely find an unfair relationship had been created between Mr L and Creation.

On 17 February 2023, the investigator recommended that Mr L keep the system and Creation take into account what Mr L had paid so far, along with the benefits he received, and make sure the system was effectively self-funding.

Mr L accepted the investigator's view. Creation has not responded to this assessment. As Creation did not respond to the assessment, the case was progressed to the next stage of our process, an Ombudsman's decision. I consider that Creation has had time sufficient to have made a response in this case, had it wished to do so. So, I am proceeding to a 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.

My findings on jurisdiction

I'm satisfied I have jurisdiction to consider Mr L's complaint, both in respect of the refusal by Creation to accept and pay his s.75 claim and the allegations of an unfair relationship under s.140A.

The s.75 complaint

The event complained of here is Creation's alleged wrongful rejection of Mr L's s.75 claim on 24 May 2022, this relates to a regulated activity under our compulsory jurisdiction. Mr L brought his complaint about this to the ombudsman service on 8 June 2022. So, his complaint in relation to the s.75 claim was brought in time for the purposes of our jurisdiction.

The Unfair relationship under s.140A complaint

The event complained of here is Creation's participation, for so long as the credit relationship continues, in an alleged unfair relationship with Mr L. Here the relationship was ongoing at the time it was referred to the ombudsman service on 8 June 2022, so the complaint has been brought in time for the purposes of our jurisdiction.

Merits

The s.75 complaint

The law imposes a six-year limitation period on claims for misrepresentation and breach of contract, after which they become time barred.

In this case the alleged misrepresentation and alleged breach cause of action arose when an agreement was entered into on 9 March 2015. Mr L brought his s.75 claim to Creation on 22 March 2022, that is more than six years after he entered into an agreement with them. Given this, I think it was fair and reasonable for Creation to have not accepted the s.75 claim. So, I do not uphold this aspect of the complaint.

The unfair relationship under s.140A complaint

When considering whether representations and contractual promises by M can be considered under s.140A I've looked at the court's approach to s.140A.

In *Scotland & Reast v British Credit Trust [2014] EWCA Civ 790* the Court of Appeal said a court must consider the whole relationship between the creditor and the debtor arising out of the credit agreement and whether it is unfair, including having regard to anything done (or not done) by or on behalf of the creditor before the making of the agreement. A misrepresentation by the creditor or a false or misleading presentation are relevant and important aspects of a transaction.

Section 56 ('s.56') of the CCA has the effect of deeming M to be the agent of Creation in any antecedent negotiations.

Taking this into account, I consider it would be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances for me to consider as part of the complaint about an alleged unfair relationship those negotiations and arrangements by M for which Creation were responsible under s.56 when considering whether it is likely Creation had acted fairly and reasonably towards Mr L.

But in doing so, I should take into account all the circumstances and consider whether a Court would likely find the relationship with Creation was unfair under s140A.

What happened?

Mr L has said that he was told by M's representative that the cost of the system would be fully paid for by the FIT payments he would receive and the savings he would make. And Mr L has told us that whilst he had been interested in more ecological energy, he was persuaded to go ahead with the solar panels because of assurances he received from M's representative. Whilst Mr L told us he had some thoughts about making his home more eco friendly, I have been shown no evidence that Mr L had already decided to take out solar panels before he was visited by M's representative.

Mr L told us he agreed to the loan due to the,

“verbal promises that we would make money from our roof. The sales person made it very clear in his verbal sales speech that the money generated from the roof plus the cheaper day to day running costs would mean there the entire system being installed would be self funding.”

I've looked at the documents provided by Mr L to see if there was anything contained within it that made it clear that the solar panel system wouldn't be self-funding.

The loan agreement, signed by Mr L on 9 March 2015, sets out Mr L's responsibilities for repaying the loan amount and the monthly cost of that. Looking at the loan agreement it specifies that the goods being purchased were solar panels. So, I'm satisfied the loan was taken in Mr L's name to solely purchase the system sold by M.

But the loan agreement contains no mention of the income or savings that may be generated. So, there was no way for Mr L to compare his total costs against the financial benefits he was allegedly being promised from that document. Given the contract doesn't contain information about the benefits, Mr L would have looked to M's representative to help him understand how much the panels would cost, what they would bring in and how much he would benefit from the system in order for him to make a decision.

Creation hasn't provided evidence to dispute what Mr L said happened. And Mr L left the meeting having agreed to an interest-bearing loan, with a monthly repayment of around £110, payable for 10 years. Given the financial burden he took on, and in the absence of any evidence from Creation to the contrary, I find Mr L's account of what he was told by M to be credible and persuasive. The loan is a costly long-term commitment, and I can't see why he would have seen this purchase as appealing had he not been given the reassurances he's said he received from M.

I have noted that our investigator thought that Mr L's testimony seemed persuasive and explained why they thought that in their assessment. I have noted that Creation has not responded to that part of the assessment.

For the solar panels to pay for themselves, they would need to produce combined savings and FIT income of around £1,330 per year. I have not seen anything to indicate Mr L's

system was not performing as expected but his system was unlikely to produce that and Mr L's testimony is that it didn't. The information about Mr L's FIT payments also suggest that the solar panel system failed to generate anything close to the sort of income required to meet Mr L's loan repayments.

So, these statements were not true. I think the salesman from M must reasonably have been aware that Mr L's system would not have produced benefits at this level. I think the salesman would have known that Mr L's system would not produce enough benefits to cover the overall cost of the system in the timescales stated verbally to Mr L.

Considering Mr L's account about what he was told, and the documentation he was shown at the time of the sale, and in the absence of any other evidence from Creation to the contrary, I think it likely M gave Mr L a false and misleading impression of the self-funding nature of the solar panel system. On balance, I find Mr L's account to be plausible and convincing.

I consider M's misleading presentation went to an important aspect of the transaction for the system, namely the benefits and savings which Mr L was expected to receive by agreeing to the installation of the system. I consider that M's assurances in this regard likely amounted to a contractual promise that the solar panel system would have the capacity to fund the loan repayments. But, even if they did not have that effect, they nonetheless represented the basis upon which Mr L went into the transaction. Either way, I think M's assurances were seriously misleading and false, undermining the purpose of the transaction from Mr L's point of view

Would the court be likely to make a finding of unfairness under s.140a

Where Creation is to be treated as responsible for M's negotiations with Mr L in respect of its misleading and false assurances as to the self-funding nature of the solar panel system, I'm persuaded a court would likely conclude that because of this the relationship between Mr L and Creation was unfair.

Because of this shortfall between his costs and the actual benefits, each month he has had to pay more than he expected to cover the difference between his solar benefits and the cost of the loan. So, clearly Creation has benefitted from the interest paid on a loan he would otherwise have not taken out.

Putting things right

Fair compensation

In all the circumstances I consider that the fair compensation should aim to remedy the unfairness of Mr L and Creation's relationship arising out of M's misleading and false assurances as to the self-funding nature of the solar panel system. I require Creation to repay Mr L a sum that corresponds to the outcome he could reasonably have expected as a result of M's assurances. That is, that Mr L's loan repayments should amount to no more than the financial benefits he receives for the duration of the loan agreement.

Therefore, to resolve the complaint, Creation should recalculate the agreement based on the known and assumed savings and income Mr L received from the solar panel system over the 10-year term of the loan, so he pays no more than that. To do that, I think it's important to consider the benefit Mr L received by way of FIT payments as well as through energy savings. Mr L may need to supply up to date details to help Creation make that calculation. But Creation can and should use assumptions

when information is not available. I say this particularly as we have been informed that Mr L has sold the house and does not have access to much documentation from before this.

Mr L told us that the loan is still running.

So, to put things right Creation Consumer Finance Ltd must:

- Calculate the total repayments Mr L made towards the loan up until the date of settlement – A
- Use Mr L's electricity bills, FIT statements and meter readings to work out the known and assumed benefits he received and he would have received over the 10 year loan period – B
- Use B to recalculate what Mr L should have repaid each month towards the loan and apply 8% simple interest to any overpayment from the date of his payment until the date of settlement – C
- Reimburse C to Mr L.
- Give Mr L the option of offsetting this amount [C] from any outstanding loan amount, recalculating either his monthly payments or remaining loan term, or a refund of the overpayments.

I agree Creation's refusal to consider the claim under s140A has also caused Mr L some further inconvenience. And I think the £100 compensation recommended by our investigator is broadly a fair way to recognise that.

* If Creation considers that it's required by HM Revenue & Customs to deduct income tax from that interest, it should tell Mr L how much tax it's taken off. It should also give Mr L a tax deduction certificate if he asks for one, so he can reclaim the tax from HM Revenue & Customs if appropriate."

Creation Consumer Finance Ltd should also be aware that whether my determination constitutes a money award or direction (or a combination), what I decide is fair compensation need not be what a court would award or order. This reflects the nature of the ombudsman service's scheme as one which is intended to be fair, quick, and informal.

My final decision

For the reasons I have explained I uphold Mr L's complaint. I require Creation Consumer Finance Ltd to calculate and pay the fair compensation as detailed above.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr L to accept or reject my decision before 27 June 2024.

Douglas Sayers
Ombudsman