

## **Complaint**

Mr R has complained about an overdraft that Santander UK Plc (“Santander”) provided to him.

He says the overdraft he was provided with, which was then had its limit increased, was unaffordable for him and he was allowed to continue using even when he was using it unsustainably.

## **Background**

Santander initially provided Mr R with an overdraft that had a limit of £2,350.00 in 2016. The credit limit was then increased to £2,550.00 in August 2018 after it had previously been reduced to £1,900.00.

One of our investigators reviewed what Mr R and Santander had told us. And he thought Santander hadn’t done anything wrong or treated Mr R unfairly in relation to providing the overdraft or increasing the credit limit. So he didn’t recommend that Mr R’s complaint be upheld.

Mr R disagreed and asked for an ombudsman to look at the complaint.

## **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 R’s complaint.

Having carefully considered everything, I’ve decided not to uphold Mr R’s complaint. I’ll explain why in a little more detail.

Santander needed to make sure it didn’t lend irresponsibly. In practice, what this means is Santander needed to carry out proportionate checks to be able to understand whether Mr R 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.

I understand that Santander agreed to Mr R's initial application after it obtained information on him income and carried out a credit search. And the information obtained indicated that Mr R would be able to make the monthly repayments due for this overdraft. On the other hand Mr R says that he shouldn't have been lent to or had his limit increased.

I've considered what the parties have said.

What's important to note is that Mr R was provided with a revolving credit facility rather than a loan. And this means that Santander was required to understand whether limits of £2,350.00 and £2,550.00 could be repaid within a reasonable period of time, rather than all in one go. It's fair to say that overdrafts of £2,350.00 and £2,550.00 would have required more than a small payment in order to clear the full amount that could be owed within a reasonable period of time.

Santander has not provided any details of the credit checks that it carried out. Nonetheless, I've considered all of the other information provided by both Santander and Mr R in order to get an idea of what Santander is likely to have had an idea of at the respective times.

Having considered the information provided, I've not seen any suggestion that Mr R had defaulted accounts, missed payments, short-term lending or high-cost borrowing. So I do not consider that what was on Mr R's credit file itself meant that Santander shouldn't have provided him with his overdraft.

Furthermore, as Mr R was an existing Santander current account holder, I've looked at his transaction history in the period leading up to his overdraft applications. I think that it is fair to say that Mr R's transaction history not only showed that he was receiving a regular salary, but the amount he had left each month was sufficient to clear limits of £2,350.00 and £2,550.00 within a reasonable period of time.

I fully accept it's possible that Mr R's position might have been worse than what it looks like on the information on his account ledgers, or that it worsened after the credit limit increase took place. But it wouldn't be fair and reasonable for me to use hindsight here, or say that Santander should have known this was the case at the time it was making its lending decisions. This is especially as the available information indicates that Mr R could repay what he could owe at the time the lending decisions were made.

For the sake of completeness, I've also considered the position in relation to Mr R's overdraft usage once the facility was granted. But it's clear that Mr R only used his overdraft sporadically. Indeed he didn't use it all from 2016 onwards and he instead had significant surplus balances.

In these circumstances, I do not agree that Santander ought to have realised that Mr R might have been experiencing financial difficulty, or that he was unfairly charged as a result of being permitted to continue using his overdraft in such circumstances.

Overall and having carefully considered everything, I don't think that Santander treated Mr R unfairly or unreasonably when providing him with his overdraft, subsequently increasing the limit, or allowing him to continue using the facility. And I'm not upholding Mr R's complaint. I appreciate this will be very disappointing for Mr R. But I hope he'll understand the reasons for my decision and that he'll at least feel his concerns have been listened to.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons I've explained, I'm not upholding Mr R's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr R to accept or reject my decision before 4 June 2024.

Jeshen Narayanan  
**Ombudsman**