

Complaint

Mr B complains that Moneybarn No. 1 Limited ("Moneybarn") unfairly entered into a conditional sale agreement with him. He's said that the payments to the agreement were unaffordable and he should never have been lent to.

Background

In February 2023, Moneybarn provided Mr B with finance for a used car. The purchase price of the vehicle was £10,499.00. Mr B paid a deposit of £2,000.00 and took out a conditional sale agreement with Moneybarn for the remaining £8,499.00. The loan had interest and charges of £4,353.56 and a 60-month term. This meant that the total amount to be repaid of £12,852.56 (not including Mr B's deposit) was due to be repaid in 59 monthly instalments of £217.84.

Mr B complained that the agreement was unaffordable and so should never have been provided to him. Moneybarn didn't uphold the complaint. It said that its checks confirmed that the finance was affordable and so it was reasonable to lend.

Mr B's complaint was considered by one of our investigators. She didn't think that Moneybarn had done anything wrong or treated Mr B unfairly. So she didn't recommend that Mr B's complaint should be upheld. Mr B disagreed with our investigator and the complaint 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 irresponsible and unaffordable lending on our website. And I've used this approach to help me decide Mr B's complaint.

Having carefully thought about everything I've been provided with, I'm not upholding Mr B's complaint. I'd like to explain why in a little more detail.

Moneybarn needed to make sure that it didn't lend irresponsibly. In practice, what this means is that Moneybarn needed to carry out proportionate checks to be able to understand whether any lending was sustainable for Mr B before providing it.

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 that information – 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, the amount lent was high, or the information the lender had – such as a significantly impaired credit history – suggested the lender needed to know more about a prospective borrower's ability to repay.

Moneybarn says it agreed to this application after Mr B provided details of his monthly income, which it verified with payslips. It also carried out credit searches on Mr B, which had shown he had historic defaults on credit accounts but he had no county court judgments ("CCJ") recorded against him at this time. Finally, it also says that the credit check demonstrated that Mr B had a low level of active debt at the time – certainly in comparison to his verified income.

In Moneybarn's view, when the amount Mr B already owed plus a reasonable amount for Mr B's living expenses were deducted from his monthly income the monthly payments for this agreement were still affordable.

On the other hand, Mr B says that these payments were unaffordable.

I've thought about what Mr B and Moneybarn have said.

The first thing for me to say is that I'm not persuaded that the checks Moneybarn carried out did go far enough. For example, I'm not persuaded that it was reasonable to rely on an estimate of Mr B's living costs given what Moneybarn saw on its credit checks. And I think that this ought to have led Moneybarn to do more to ascertain Mr B's actual regular living costs. That said, I don't think that obtaining further information on Mr B's actual living costs would have made a difference to Moneybarn's decision to lend in this instance.

I say this because having considered the information Mr B has provided on his circumstances from the time, when Mr B's actual living expenses are added to his active credit commitments and then deducted from his monthly income he appears to have enough left over to repay this agreement. So I think that Moneybarn obtaining further information is likely to have led it to conclude that did have the funds, at the time at least, to sustainably make the repayments due under this agreement.

I know that Mr B was making payments to a debt management company to repay his previous debts. But even when these are factored in, Mr B didn't have much in the way of active credit. And this low level of active credit does appear to ensure that Mr B is left with sufficient funds to be able to make his payments.

I'd also point out that although this in itself is not determinative, Mr B has nonetheless made all of the payments due on this agreement so far. And I have to question why he has complained so soon after taking the agreement rather than taken any steps to reduce his liability – by for example, taking steps to return the vehicle.

I accept it's possible that Mr B's actual circumstances at the time might have been worse than what I've seen here. But a lender is only able to make a decision based on what it has, or at the very least is likely to have. So while I do appreciate that it might be proving more difficult for Mr B to make his payments than he'd anticipated, the crucial thing here is that I don't think that asking for more information would have prevented Moneybarn from lending in this instance.

Overall and having carefully considered everything, while I'm not persuaded that Moneybarn's checks before entering into this conditional sale agreement with Mr B did go far enough, I'm satisfied that carrying out reasonable and proportionate checks won't have stopped Moneybarn from providing these funds, or entering into this agreement with him.

As this is the case, I don't think that Moneybarn acted unfairly or unreasonably towards Mr B. So I'm not upholding this complaint. I appreciate that this will be disappointing for

Mr B. But I hope he'll understand the reasons for my decision and at least consider that his concerns have been listened to.

Although I'm not upholding Mr B's complaint, I would remind Moneybarn of its obligation to exercise forbearance and due consideration (bearing in mind what Mr B now says) in the event that Mr B is experiencing financial difficulty during the course of it collecting payments on the agreement.

My final decision

My final decision is that I'm not upholding Mr B's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr B to accept or reject my decision before 15 January 2024.

Jeshen Narayanan
Ombudsman