

## **Complaint**

Mr C complains that Moneybarn No.1 Limited (“Moneybarn”) unfairly entered into a conditional sale agreement with him. He’s said that the agreement was unaffordable and he ended up having to prioritise the repayments to this agreement which required him to borrow elsewhere in order to meet his living costs.

## **Background**

In August 2015, Moneybarn provided Mr C with finance for a used car. The cash price of the car was £10,950.00. Mr C paid a deposit of £250 and received a part exchange value of £1,000.00 for his previous vehicle. He then entered into a conditional sale agreement with Moneybarn for the remaining amount of £9,750.00.

The loan had total interest, fees and charges of £6,800.29 and a 48-month term. This meant that the balance to be repaid of £16,500.29 (which does not include Mr C’s deposit) was due to be repaid in 47 monthly instalments of £351.07.

In February 2024, Mr C complained to Moneybarn saying that it shouldn’t have entered into this conditional sale agreement with him. He said that Moneybarn ought to have realised that the monthly payments were unaffordable and he ended up having to prioritise the repayments to this agreement, which required him to borrow elsewhere in order to meet his living costs.

Moneybarn did not uphold Mr C’s complaint. It believed that Mr C had complained about too late. Mr C remained dissatisfied at Moneybarn’s final response and referred his complaint to our service. When providing its file of papers on Mr C’s complaint, Moneybarn told us that it believed Mr C had complained too late.

Mr C’s complaint was considered by one of our investigators. She reached the conclusion that proportionate checks would not have shown Moneybarn that it shouldn’t have entered into the conditional sale agreement with Mr C. So she didn’t think that Mr C’s complaint should be upheld.

Mr C 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.

### *Basis for my consideration of this complaint*

There are time limits for referring a complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service. Moneybarn has argued that Mr C’s complaint was made too late because he complained more than six years after the decision to provide the finance as well as more than three years after he ought reasonably to have been aware of his cause to make this complaint.

Our investigator explained why it was reasonable to interpret Mr C's complaint as being one alleging that the relationship between him and Moneybarn was unfair to him as described in s140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 ("CCA"). She also explained why this complaint about an allegedly unfair lending relationship had been made in time.

Having carefully considered everything, I've decided not to uphold Mr C's complaint. Given the reasons for this, I'm satisfied that whether Mr C's complaint was made in time or not has no impact on that outcome.

I'm also in agreement with the investigator that Mr C's complaint should be considered more broadly than just the lending decision. I consider this to be the case as Mr C has not only complained not about the decision to lend but has also alleged that the payments to this agreement required him to borrow elsewhere in order to meet his living costs.

I'm therefore satisfied that Mr C's complaint can therefore reasonably be interpreted as a complaint about the overall fairness of the lending relationship between him and Moneybarn. I acknowledge Moneybarn still doesn't agree we can look Mr C's complaint, but given the outcome I have reached, I do not consider it necessary for me to make any further comment, or reach any findings on these matters.

In deciding what is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of Mr C's case, I am required to take relevant law into account. As, for the reasons I've explained above, I'm satisfied that Mr C's complaint is about the fairness of the lending relationship between him and Moneybarn, relevant law in this case includes s140A, s140B and s140C of the CCA.

S140A says that a court may make an order under s140B if it determines that the relationship between the creditor (Moneybarn) and the debtor (Mr C), arising out of a credit agreement is unfair to the debtor because of one or more of the following, having regard to all matters it thinks relevant:

- any of the terms of the agreement;
- the way in which the creditor has exercised or enforced any of his rights under the agreement;
- any other thing done or not done by or on behalf of the creditor.

Case law shows that a court assesses whether a relationship is unfair at the date of the hearing, or if the credit relationship ended before then, at the date it ended. That assessment has to be performed having regard to the whole history of the relationship. S140B sets out the types of orders a court can make where a credit relationship is found to be unfair – these are wide powers, including reducing the amount owed or requiring a refund, or to do or not do any particular thing.

Given Mr C's complaint, I therefore need to think about whether Moneybarn's decision to lend to Mr C, or its later actions resulted in the lending relationship between Mr C and Moneybarn being unfair to Mr C, such that it ought to have acted to put right the unfairness – and if so whether it did enough to remove that unfairness.

Mr C's relationship with Moneybarn is therefore likely to be unfair if it didn't carry out reasonable and proportionate checks into Mr C's ability to repay in circumstances where doing so would have revealed the repayments to the agreement to have been unaffordable, or that it was irresponsible to lend. And if this was the case, Moneybarn didn't then somehow remove the unfairness this created.

I'll now turn to whether Moneybarn acted fairly and reasonably when entering into the conditional sale agreement with Mr C.

*What we consider when looking at complaints about irresponsible or unaffordable lending*

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 C 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 C provided details of his income which it verified with copies of payslips. It says it also carried out credit searches on Mr C which showed that he had previously defaults on credit agreements with the most recent of these taking place eighteen months prior to this application. Mr C also had two county court judgments ("CCJ") recorded against him but as this was from more than four years prior to this application, it believed them to be historic.

In Moneybarn's view, when reasonable repayments towards the amount Mr C owed on his active accounts, plus a reasonable amount for Mr C's living expenses were deducted from his monthly income the monthly payments were affordable.

On the other hand, Mr C says the monthly payments were unaffordable and entering into the conditional sale agreement with him in these circumstances resulted in him having to borrow from elsewhere to meet his living costs.

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

The first thing for me to say is that I don't think that the checks Moneybarn carried out did go far enough. I don't think it was reasonable to rely on an estimate of Mr C's living costs given the adverse information on his credit file.

However, I think it's worth me emphasising that just because I don't think that Moneybarn carried out sufficient checks this, on its own, doesn't mean that Mr C's complaint should be upheld.

Indeed, where a firm didn't carry out sufficient checks we would usually only go on to uphold a complaint in circumstances where we were able to recreate what reasonable and proportionate checks are likely to have shown – typically using information from the consumer – and this clearly shows that the repayments in question were unaffordable. I think that this is important context to keep in mind.

As I don't think that Moneybarn did carry out proportionate checks, I have gone on to consider what I think such checks into Mr C's circumstances are more likely than not to have shown Moneybarn.

Bearing in mind the length of time of the agreement and the amount of the monthly payment, I would have expected Moneybarn to have had a reasonable understanding about Mr C's regular living expenses as well as his income and existing credit commitments.

Having considered everything provided, I don't think that Moneybarn carrying out further checks is more likely than not to have made a difference here. I say this because I'm satisfied that Moneybarn is still likely to have lent to Mr C even if it had found out more about his actual living expenses, rather than relied on estimates.

In my view, when reasonable repayments to Mr C's existing credit are added to the payments which I've been able to see for Mr C's living expenses (in the information he has provided) and then deducted from the funds he received, he does appear to have had sufficient funds to make the payments to this agreement.

Mr C has said that such an analysis does not include all of his expenditure. He's said that there are some items which he was paying cash for and which do not appear on the statements he has provided. He also says that payments to non-essential expenses such as hobbies and alcohol should also be considered.

However, I think that Mr C's expectations of a proportionate check are above what was expected of firms at the time. Indeed, some of what Mr C has suggested do not form part of the requirements even now. In my view, a proportionate check would not have extended into a complete review of Mr C's finances in the way that his submissions appear to suggest that it does.

I also have to keep in mind that Mr C's most recent submissions are being made in support of a claim for compensation. And, at the time at least, Mr C wanted the car that he had chosen. I therefore think that any explanations Mr C would have provided at the time are more likely to have been with a view to persuading Moneybarn to lend, rather than highlighting any unaffordability. I think it unlikely that Mr C would have volunteered that he had the level of expenditure he's now referring to, particularly as Moneybarn wasn't required to request bank statements from him in the first place.

Having considered all of this and weighed it up in the round, I don't think that Moneybarn accepted an application that was obviously unaffordable, or that it ought reasonably to have realised would cause significant harm to Mr C. As this is the case, I don't think that it was unfair for Moneybarn to have entered into this conditional sale agreement with Mr C, or that it doing so created unfairness.

Overall, and based on the available evidence I don't find that the lending relationship between Mr C and Moneybarn was unfair to Mr C. I've not been persuaded that Moneybarn created unfairness in its relationship with Mr C by irresponsibly lending to him when it entered into this conditional sale agreement with him. And I don't find Moneybarn treated Mr C unfairly in any other way either based on what I've seen.

So overall and having considered everything, while I can understand Mr C's sentiments and appreciate why he is unhappy, I'm nonetheless not upholding this complaint. I appreciate that this will be very disappointing for Mr C. 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**

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

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr C to accept or

reject my decision before 24 March 2025.

Jeshen Narayanan  
**Ombudsman**