

## **The complaint**

Miss E complains that Healthcare Finance Limited (“HFL”) failed to pay out on a claim she made to it about the failure of a supplier to deliver the dental treatment which she paid for with credit it provided.

## **What happened**

In October 2022 Miss E entered into a 25-month fixed sum loan agreement with HFL to fund the provision of dental aligners from a third-party supplier to straighten her teeth. It was expected that the treatment would last for four months.

It seems clear that Miss E was not happy with the results of the treatment and Miss E says that the supplier provided several ‘aligner touch ups’ to try and improve the outcome. However, she was still not satisfied with the results by the time that supplier went into administration in December 2023.

In January 2024, Miss E therefore contacted HFL to make a claim, requesting a full refund of all treatment costs, which it considered as a potential breach of contract under Section 75 of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 (‘Section 75’). Ultimately, HFL accepted that Miss E had suffered a loss and refunded her what it said was the value of one set of touch up aligners, which it considered may have been provided by the supplier, and to which Miss E may have had a contractual right. This was in the amount of £220. Unhappy with that response, Miss E brought a complaint to us.

Our investigator considered how HFL had acted in light of its responsibilities under Section 75. However, she did not uphold the complaint and concluded that HFL’s offer was fair and it was not unreasonable of it to decline to refund the full cost of treatment.

Miss E doesn’t accept that and asked an Ombudsman to look into things.

## **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.

Section 75 enables Miss E to make a claim against HFL for breach of contract by the supplier of the goods/service in question. Certain criteria apply to Section 75 in respect of things like the cost of the goods or services and the parties to the agreement. I am satisfied there are no concerns in respect of these criteria, and indeed HFL has accepted Miss E’s claim in this regard. So I have moved on to consider if there is persuasive evidence of a breach of contract or misrepresentation by the supplier that means HFL should have offered more than it has when handling Miss E’s claim.

But I want to explain from the outset that I can only consider Miss E’s complaint on that narrow basis – i.e. whether it was fair and reasonable for HFL to respond to her claim by offering what it did. I cannot hold it responsible for Miss E’s experience with the supplier or her feelings about the treatment. HFL simply has a legal duty to consider whether she has a

valid claim under Section 75 and to respond fairly to that claim if so.

Miss E's concerns are that she was still undergoing treatment, and now cannot complete that, as the supplier is no longer in business. So she believes she should receive a full refund as what she paid for has not been provided.

To be clear, I don't accept that Miss E hasn't finished her treatment. From the information I have (primarily Miss E's own testimony) I am satisfied that, on balance, the fundamental service paid for was the provision of a set of aligners used for straightening teeth over a relatively short term. As mentioned, that treatment began in October 2022 and was expected to last a matter of some four months. The treatment itself is *not* something that is ongoing until the customer is satisfied with the results.

What is clearly the case though is that she is not happy with the results of the treatment. Therefore, the supplier had provided her with some further aligners to try and improve the results for her.

In cases such as this it is often complex to assess the quality of the service Miss E paid for. Results from such treatments are, of course, subject to many variables and there are generally disclaimers by the providers of such services, and accepted risks that results simply cannot be guaranteed. I, of course, am not a dental expert. And Miss E has not provided an independent, expert opinion that sets out that the treatment she paid for has not been done with reasonable 'care and skill', as implied by the Consumer Rights Act 2015 ('CRA'). It is that, rather than the *results* of the treatment, that is the crucial issue for me in considering whether it was fair and reasonable for HFL to respond to her claim as it did.

But I need to consider what I think Miss E's contract with the supplier agreed to provide in terms of treatment. In that way, I can determine whether there has been a breach of an explicit term of it. I don't have a contract signed by Miss E as I understand they were housed in an online application which no longer holds that content since the supplier went into administration. However, HFL has been able to provide a sample document called a "*Consent and History Form*". This document is not dated, but is noted to be 'v3.7'. HFL says it would have been in use at the time that Miss E commenced her treatment in 2022. Where there are evidential uncertainties, as here, it is my role to determine what I think is more likely than not to have happened, or been the case.

In the absence of anything else, I think it is more likely than not that Miss E would have been provided with a document sufficiently similar in layout and content to the sample I have for me to be able to rely on it. So I have considered the content of it carefully.

Importantly, the final section before the customer was required to sign set out that:

*"I understand that [the supplier] cannot guarantee any specific results or outcomes."*

So I'm satisfied the supplier never said that it could guarantee her satisfaction with the results of the treatment. That means I don't find a breach of any explicit terms of the contract between Miss E and the supplier. But that is only the first question I have considered.

As set out above, the CRA says that there are also implied terms of contracts – not everything has to be fully spelled out. In this scenario, the implied terms of this contract are that the supplier would provide the service Miss E paid for with reasonable care and skill. I've already set out why I don't have the evidence to reach a conclusion that it didn't.

However, HFL apparently accepts that Miss E may have been able to access some further support via the supplier's lifetime guarantee scheme. What that offered was the *possibility* of

having aligner touch-ups every year, provided that Miss E carried on buying retainers, and that a dentist approved the provision of the touch-up aligners. My understanding is that a dentist would only do so if s/he assessed that further progress to straighten the teeth would be possible through a touch-up aligner.

Despite her not having bought any retainers from the supplier, HFL thought that Miss E had potentially lost out as the supplier was no longer trading and could not provide her with a further touch-up aligner after it went into administration. And so it offered to pay her the value of a set of those aligners.

But Miss E thinks she should be provided with a full refund of the treatment costs. I have set out why I don't find that there has been a breach of an explicit contract term in respect of treatment results, or indeed those terms implied in the contract. Whilst I am clear that she did not meet all of the eligibility requirements for the supplier's lifetime guarantee, HFL has made an offer as if she were. But even if I thought she were eligible, given the stage of treatment she was at, that guarantee would never have given her the option of a refund of the treatment costs. It's clear from the information I have that a refund was only available for the first 30 days after Miss E began her treatment in 2022, and only if Miss E had not opened or used the aligners. So it would not be fair or reasonable for me to tell HFL that it should now provide Miss E with a full refund to recompense her for the supplier going into administration.

I have also thought about the amount HFL has offered Miss E so far. I am satisfied that the £220 is a fair estimate of the cost of a set of touch-up aligners, as I have seen evidence provided by the supplier to HFL to confirm that. So essentially it has compensated her for the loss of one year's 'use' of the lifetime guarantee. And that is despite the fact that she had not met all the contractual requirements to be eligible for it.

Finally, Miss E has told us that her bank did provide her with a partial refund related to her contract with HFL, via something called a chargeback. She said the bank, "...recognised the breach in contract." Clearly, I have no idea why the chargeback apparently succeeded, including whether HFL even defended it. Or what Miss E's bank thought about it. That is a matter for them. But it isn't relevant to my considerations anyway. I am satisfied that I have all the evidence I need in order to reach a conclusion in this complaint.

Although I am sorry to hear of Miss E's disappointment with this situation, with Section 75 in mind, I don't think it would be fair or reasonable to conclude that HFL should refund her the costs of this treatment. What it has already offered is fair and need not do anything else.

I am not certain whether HFL has already paid Miss H the £220 it offered. If not, I require it to honour that offer now.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons I've explained, I don't uphold this complaint and Healthcare Finance Limited need only pay Miss H the £220 it has already offered her.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss E to accept or reject my decision before 3 January 2025.

Siobhan McBride  
**Ombudsman**