

The complaint

The estate of Mr W's complaint is, in essence, that Shawbrook Bank Limited (the 'Lender') acted unfairly and unreasonably by (1) being party to an unfair credit relationship with Mr W under Section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 (as amended) (the 'CCA') and (2) deciding against paying a claim under Section 75 of the CCA.

This complaint was originally brought by Mr W himself as the loan agreement in question was in his sole name, but he has sadly since died. As such, the complaint is now brought by his estate. Whilst being cognisant of this, I shall refer to both Mr W and his wife Mrs W throughout where applicable, as the timeshare in question was bought in their joint names.

What happened

Mr and Mrs W were existing members of an asset-backed timeshare membership having bought 747 fractional points (the 'Fractional Club 1') from a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') on 18 July 2013. This purchase was funded by a loan from a different finance provider and a complaint about this purchase and finance has been considered by this Service in a separate decision.

The following year, on 25 March 2014 (the 'Time of Sale'), Mr and Mrs W purchased an 'upgrade' of their membership (the 'Fractional Club 2') from the Supplier. They entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 1,820 fractional points at a cost of £26,512 (the 'Purchase Agreement') but after trading in their existing 747 fractional points towards the purchase they ended up paying £15,517 for their Fractional Club membership.

Like their first purchase, Fractional Club 2 membership was asset backed – which meant it gave Mr and Mrs W more than just holiday rights. It also included a share in the net sale proceeds of a property named on their Purchase Agreement (the 'Allocated Property') after their membership term ends.

Mr W paid for their Fractional Club 2 membership by taking finance of £15,517 from the Lender in his sole name (the 'Credit Agreement').

Mr W – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender on 17 March 2022 (the 'Letter of Complaint') to complain about:

1. Misrepresentations by the Supplier at the Time of Sale giving him a claim against the Lender under Section 75 of the CCA, which the Lender failed to accept and pay.
2. The Lender being party to an unfair credit relationship under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA.

Section 75 of the CCA: the Supplier's misrepresentations at the Time of Sale

Mr W said that the Supplier made a number of pre-contractual misrepresentations at the Time of Sale – namely that the Supplier:

- Told them that Fractional Club 2 membership would be an investment that they could put

towards their pension.

- Told them that Fractional Club 2 membership was an investment that would be sold on a set day and they would get their money back, and in all likelihood, a profit from the sale, when that was not true.
- Told them that the additional points would allow them to holiday anywhere, and offer them better availability and a higher standard of accommodation when that was not true.

Mr W said that he has a claim against the Supplier in respect of one or more of the misrepresentations set out above, and therefore, under Section 75 of the CCA, he has a like claim against the Lender, who, with the Supplier, is jointly and severally liable to him¹.

Section 140A of the CCA: the Lender's participation in an unfair credit relationship

The Letter of Complaint set out several reasons why Mr W said that the credit relationship between him and the Lender was unfair to him under Section 140A of the CCA. In summary, they included the following:

- Fractional Club 2 membership was marketed and sold to them as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare, Holiday Products, Resale and Exchange Contracts Regulations 2010 (the 'Timeshare Regulations').
- They were pressured into purchasing Fractional Club 2 membership by the Supplier, and they were given no time to read the documentation.
- The decision to lend was irresponsible because the Lender didn't carry out the right creditworthiness assessment, no income and expenditure information was requested, and no proof of income was required.
- The Supplier failed to disclose to them how much commission it was receiving from the Lender resulting from this Credit Agreement.
- It was not made clear that the annual fees would increase significantly.

The Lender dealt with Mr W's concerns as a claim and issued its response on 17 May 2022, rejecting it on every ground. It told Mr W that if he did not agree with this outcome, he could make a formal complaint which it would consider. PR, on Mr W's behalf, told the Lender he did not accept this outcome and wanted it to deal with his complaint, but it appears that the Lender did not send Mr W its final response.

Mr W, via his PR, referred his complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service on 4 November 2022. And as part of the submissions, alongside the relevant sales documentation, was a witness statement from Mrs W, dated 17 July 2019 which set out her memories of the circumstances surrounding both sales by the Supplier.

Mr W's complaint was assessed by an Investigator who, having considered the information on file, upheld the complaint on its merits.

The Investigator thought that the Supplier had marketed and sold Fractional Club 2 membership as an investment to Mr and Mrs W at the Time of Sale in breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations. And given the impact of that breach on their purchasing decision, the Investigator concluded that the resultant credit relationship between the Lender and Mr W was rendered unfair to him for the purposes of section 140A of the CCA.

¹ Since Mr W has now sadly died, the Lender is, with the Supplier, jointly and severally liable to the estate of Mr W.

The Lender disagreed with the Investigator's assessment and asked for an Ombudsman's decision – which is why it was passed to me.

On 10 October 2024 I issued a Provisional Decision (the 'PD') on this complaint, upholding it. In the PD I set out that I thought the Supplier had sold and/or marketed the Fractional Club to Mr and Mrs W as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations. And I thought the impact of that breach on their purchasing decision was such that it rendered Mr W's resultant credit relationship with the Lender unfair to him for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA. I then went on to say how I thought the Lender should calculate and pay fair compensation to the estate of Mr W.

The estate of Mr W agreed with the findings in my PD and had nothing further to add. The Lender responded at length, disagreeing with my provisional findings. It said, in summary:

- The PD was premised on a material error of law in its approach to the prohibition under Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations and erred in its application of that prohibition to the underlying documentation in support of the Fractional Club 2 sale.
- The error(s) above undermined the approach to the witness testimony supporting the estate of Mr W's complaint; and
- The PD was premised on a material error of law in its approach to the legal test to determine the existence of an unfair relationship.

The Lender then went on to set out how it thought the PD erred in its approaches above. While I don't intend to repeat its submissions here in detail, I will summarise them:

- It is inevitable that the customer would have been told about the return (of monies) following the sale of the Allocated Property as that is a feature of the product, as are the holiday rights and term of the product.
- There is nothing inherent in the nature of Fractional Club which contravenes Regulation 14(3).
- The wording of the PD is inconsistent with the definition of an "*investment*" as set out in (*'Shawbrook & BPF v FOS'*)². The PD errs in conflating the two meanings of the word 'return' – a 'return' on investment (the measure of profit) and being told some money would be 'returned' upon the sale (no connotation of investment or profit). The customer being told that some money would be 'returned' upon sale of the Allocated Property does not breach Regulation 14(3).
- It is not appropriate for the Ombudsman to make inferences about the conduct of the sale based on generic assumptions about Fractional Club, rather than assess the evidence on this specific complaint.

² Set out below in the Legal and Regulatory Context section

- It is not accepted that membership of the Fractional Club was described to Mr and Mrs W as an “investment” because:
 - The Information Statement says the sale did not involve an “*investment in real estate*”.
 - The contemporaneous materials referenced in the PD did not use the word “*investment*”.
 - The allegations in Mrs W’s statement are generic and it is wrong for the Ombudsman to say Fractional Club had been described as an investment in several different contexts.
- Being told there would be an amount returned upon the sale of the Allocated Property is not selling the product as an investment. It is merely describing a feature which has been found by the Court to be not inherently objectionable.
- Selling an investment requires the prospect of a financial gain/profit, and the corresponding motive on the part of the consumer. Referring to the prospect of a residual return does not satisfy this test.

The Lender continued by making submissions regarding the Fractional Club documentation and the Supplier’s sales process:

- The documentation in relation to the Fractional Club sale is unobjectionable and does not breach Regulation 14(3).
- Mr and Mrs W did not receive or view any of the sales presentation documents before they purchased Fractional Club.
- The signed disclaimers referenced show there was at no stage any representation as to the future price or value of the fractional share, and the ‘advice disclaimer’ referenced would lead the consumer to understand that the product was not being sold to them as an investment.
- The training manual referenced made no mention of the presence of the Allocated Property being an investment, nor that the purpose or benefit of the product was the opportunity to make a profit – the material indicated that there would be a “*return*” of money after 19 years.
- The ‘prospect of a financial return’ does not make something an ‘investment’ as the latter requires the intention of acquiring more than the initial outlay, and the training material emphasised customers’ expectation of receiving only a small part of their initial outlay.
- Referring to the Allocated Property as ‘ownership of bricks and mortar’ is unobjectionable.
- It is unsurprising that the Allocated Properties were maintained in pristine condition by the payment of management fees, nor that the 19-year period is the optimum period of time to see out peaks and troughs in the market, given that the proceeds of the sale will be returned to the customers – it is natural that steps are taken to ensure that the return is as high as possible.
- There is no comparison made between the expected level of financial return against the initial outlay – the primary focus was providing holidays.
- Any fair analysis of the training and contractual documentation is that the customer was told that their only investment was in holidays, and that “*some money*” would be returned, which may be a “*small part of [their] initial outlay*”.

- *Prankard v Shawbrook Bank Limited*³ considered documents and evidence regarding the training programme operated by the Supplier at the time and concluded that the product was not sold as an investment.
- The question the Ombudsman should have considered is whether there is sufficiently clear, compelling evidence that the timeshare product was marketed and sold as an investment (i.e., for intended financial profit or gain as against the initial outlay). The reasonable answer, is that the sales documentation provides no reason to consider there was any such marketing or sale.

The Lender then assessed the witness statements from Mrs W. It said, in summary:

- The witness testimony is given limited importance given the Ombudsman's conclusion that a breach of Regulation 14(3) can be inferred from the materials relating to the sale. However the Ombudsman has referenced that he does not find the allegations implausible or hard to believe.
- The statements contain material inconsistencies relating to the sale of the Fractional Club.
- The statements indicate a pattern of behaviour relating to the usage of the membership to take holidays, and struggling to do so due to poor availability. These indicate that Mr and Mrs W entered into the Fractional Club for holiday purposes, but this has been given no weight by the Ombudsman.
- Mrs W's testimony does not allege that there was hope or expectation of financial gain/profit.
- The testimony was prepared over five years after the Time of Sale. Understandably, given the passage of time, in general, the statements lack detail.
- There are material inconsistencies between the two statements, dated less than one month apart:
 - The location of their first sale varies.
 - Detail about their conditional attendance at the sales presentation varies.
 - The price of their initial holiday is wrong – it was £199 not £99.
 - One statement says they were not put under pressure, and the second one states they were not given any time to consider the contracts.
 - The first statement mentions their initial purchase being sold as an investment, but the second statement does not include this.
 - The statement shows how important the future holidays were to them.
 - Mrs W said in her statement that a cleaner told them how good an investment it was. This is simply false – very few cleaners spoke English and the Supplier did not use cleaning staff in such meetings.
- In light of the above, it is not credible that Mr and Mrs W were assured that they would "*at the very least*" recover back their initial outlay, nor is it credible that their motivation for the purchase was as an investment, and not to meet their holiday needs. At the least, the Ombudsman has to take the inaccuracies into account when assessing its overall reliability.

³ See the below section: The legal and regulatory context

- Any reliance placed by the Ombudsman on Mrs W's testimony is unsafe. The generic allegations made, supported by the PR, are a hallmark of many complaints submitted by claims management companies.

And finally, the Lender made submissions regarding the legal test applied in the PD when assessing if the relationship is unfair:

- The test to be applied, as stated in *Carney v NM Rothschild and Sons Ltd*⁴, was whether there was a "material impact on the debtor when deciding whether or not to enter the agreement".
- The Ombudsman has erred here, and applied a different test – reversing the burden of proof. It is necessary to assess whether there is sufficient evidence of a material impact on the decision to enter the agreement, not to start from the position, as the Ombudsman has done, that the prospect of a financial gain existed, but that this was not insignificant enough for it not to render the relationship unfair.
- In this case, Mr and Mrs W's circumstances (i.e. their motivations relating to access to potential destinations, availability, flexibility, usage by family and exclusivity) meant the actual sale did not have a material impact on their decision to purchase. Therefore the credit relationship was fair.

The Lender concluded its response to the PD by saying that there is no clear, compelling evidence that the Fractional Club was sold to Mr and Mrs W with the intention of financial gain, either at all, or not in a manner that was of importance when compared to their upgraded holiday entitlement.

As the deadline for responses to my PD has now passed, the complaint has come back to me to reconsider. Before I come to my findings, I'll set out what I still consider to be the relevant legal and regulatory context.

The legal and regulatory context

In considering what is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of the complaint, I am required under DISP 3.6.4R to take into account: relevant (i) law and regulations; (ii) regulators' rules, guidance and standards; and (iii) codes of practice; and (where appropriate), what I consider to have been good industry practice at the relevant time.

I will refer to and set out several regulatory requirements, legal concepts and guidance in this decision, but I am satisfied that of particular relevance to this complaint is:

- The CCA (including Section 75 and Sections 140A-140C).
- The law on misrepresentation.
- The Timeshare Regulations.
- Case law on Section 140A of the CCA – including, in particular:
 - The Supreme Court's judgment in *Plevin v Paragon Personal Finance Ltd* [2014] UKSC 61 ('*Plevin*') (which remains the leading case in this area).
 - *Scotland v British Credit Trust* [2014] EWCA Civ 790 ('*Scotland and Reast*').
 - *Patel v Patel* [2009] EWHC 3264 (QB) ('*Patel*').

⁴ See the legal and regulatory context

- The Supreme Court's judgment in *Smith v Royal Bank of Scotland Plc* [2023] UKSC 34 ('*Smith*').
- *Carney v NM Rothschild & Sons Ltd* [2018] EWHC 958 ('*Carney*').
- *Kerrigan v Elevate Credit International Ltd* [2020] EWHC 2169 (Comm) ('*Kerrigan*').
- *R (on the application of Shawbrook Bank Ltd) v Financial Ombudsman Service Ltd and R (on the application of Clydesdale Financial Services Ltd (t/a Barclays Partner Finance)) v Financial Ombudsman Service* [2023] EWHC 1069 (Admin) ('*Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*').

I have also taken into account:

- *Gallagher v Diamond Resorts (Europe) Limited* (9 February 2021, County Court at Preston).
- *Prankard v Shawbrook Bank Limited* (8 October 2021, County Court at Cardiff).

Good industry practice – the RDO Code

The Timeshare Regulations provided a regulatory framework. But as the parties to this complaint already know, I am also required to take into account, when appropriate, what I consider to have been good industry practice at the relevant time – which, in this complaint, includes the Resort Development Organisation's Code of Conduct dated 1 January 2010 (the 'RDO Code').

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.

And having done that, and having read and considered all of the reasons the Lender gave for why it disagreed with my PD, I am satisfied that this complaint should be upheld because the Supplier breached Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations by marketing and/or selling Fractional Club 2 membership to Mr and Mrs W as an investment. And in the circumstances of this complaint, this breach rendered the credit relationship between Mr W and the Lender unfair to him for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA.

However, and as both parties are aware, my role as an Ombudsman is not to address every single point that has been made to date. Instead, it is to decide what is fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint. So, while I recognise that there are a number of aspects to Mr W's complaint, it isn't necessary to make formal findings on all of them. This includes the allegations that the Supplier misrepresented the nature of the Fractional Club 2, and that the Lender lent to Mr W irresponsibly, because, even if those aspects of the complaint ought to succeed, the redress I'm awarding puts the estate of Mr W in the same or a better position than it would be if the redress was limited to those other aspects.

What is more, I have made my decision on the balance of probabilities – which means I have based it on what I think is more likely than not to have happened given the available evidence and the wider circumstances.

Section 140A of the CCA: did the Lender participate in an unfair credit relationship?

As Section 140A of the CCA is relevant law, I do have to consider it. So, in determining what is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of the case, I will consider whether the credit relationship between Mr W and the Lender was unfair.

Under Section 140A of the CCA, a debtor-creditor relationship can be found to have been or be unfair to the debtor because of one or more of the following: the terms of the credit agreement itself; how the creditor exercised or enforced its rights under the agreement; and any other thing done (or not done) by, or on behalf of, the creditor (either before or after the making of the agreement or any related agreement) (s.140A(1) CCA). Such a finding may also be based on the terms of any related agreement (which here, includes the Purchase Agreement) and, when combined with Section 56 of the CCA, on anything done or not done by the supplier on the creditor's behalf before the making of the credit agreement or any related agreement.

Section 56 plays an important role in the CCA because it defines the terms "antecedent negotiations" and "negotiator". As a result, it provides a foundation for a number of provisions that follow it. But it also creates a statutory agency in particular circumstances. And while Section 56(1) sets out three of them, the most relevant to this complaint are negotiations conducted by the supplier in relation to a transaction financed or proposed to be financed by a debtor-creditor-supplier agreement.

A debtor-creditor-supplier agreement is defined by Section 12(b) of the CCA as *"a restricted-use credit agreement which falls within section 11(1)(b) and is made by the creditor under pre-existing arrangements, or in contemplation of future arrangements, between himself and the supplier [...]"*. And Section 11(1)(b) of the CCA says that a restricted-use credit agreement is a regulated credit agreement used to *"finance a transaction between the debtor and a person (the 'supplier') other than the creditor [...]"* and *"restricted-use credit" shall be construed accordingly.*

The Lender doesn't dispute that there was a pre-existing arrangement between it and the Supplier. So, the negotiations conducted by the Supplier during the sale of Mr and Mrs W's membership of the Fractional Club 2 were conducted in relation to a transaction financed or proposed to be financed by a debtor-creditor-supplier agreement as defined by Section 12(b). That made them antecedent negotiations under Section 56(1)(c) – which, in turn, meant that they were conducted by the Supplier as an agent for the Lender as per Section 56(2). And such antecedent negotiations were "any other thing done (or not done) by, or on behalf of, the creditor" under s.140(1)(c) CCA.

Antecedent negotiations under Section 56 cover both the acts and omissions of the Supplier, as Lord Sumption made clear in *Plevin*, at paragraph 31:

"[Section] 56 provides that [when] antecedent negotiations for a debtor-creditor-supplier agreement are conducted by a credit-broker or the supplier, the negotiations are "deemed to be conducted by the negotiator in the capacity of agent of the creditor as well as in his actual capacity". The result is that the debtor's statutory rights of withdrawal from prospective agreements, cancellation and rescission may arise on account of the conduct of the negotiator whether or not he was the creditor's agent.' [...] Sections 56 and 140A(3) provide for a deemed agency, even in a case where there is no actual one. [...] These provisions are there because without them the creditor's responsibility would be engaged only by its own acts or omissions or those of its agents."

And this was recognised by Mrs Justice Collins Rice in *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS* at paragraph 135:

"By virtue of the deemed agency provision of s.56, therefore, acts or omissions 'by or on behalf of' the bank within s.140A(1)(c) may include acts or omissions of the timeshare company in 'antecedent negotiations' with the consumer".

In the case of *Scotland & Reast*, the Court of Appeal said, at paragraph 56, that the effect of Section 56(2) of the CCA meant that “*negotiations are deemed to have been conducted by the negotiator as agent for the creditor, and that is so irrespective of what the position would have been at common law*” before going on to say the following in paragraph 74:

“[...] there is nothing in the wording of s.56(2) to suggest any legislative intent to limit its application so as to exclude s.140A. Moreover, the words in s.140A(1)(c) “any other thing done (or not done) by, or on behalf of, the creditor” are entirely apposite to include antecedent negotiations falling within the scope of s.56(1)(c) and which are deemed by s.56(2) to have been conducted by the supplier as agent of the creditor. Indeed the purpose of s.56(2) is to render the creditor responsible for such statements made by the negotiator and so it seems to me wholly consistent with the scheme of the Act that, where appropriate, they should be taken into account in assessing whether the relationship between the creditor and the debtor is unfair.”⁵

So, the Supplier is deemed to be Lender’s statutory agent for the purpose of the pre-contractual negotiations.

What’s more, the scope of that responsibility extends to both acts and omissions by the Supplier as the Supreme Court in *Plevin* made clear when it referred to ‘acts or omissions’ when discussing Section 56. And as Section 56(3)(b) says that an applicable agreement can’t try to relieve a person from liability for ‘acts or omissions’ of any person acting as, or on behalf of, a negotiator, it must follow that the reference to ‘omissions’ would only be necessary because they can be attributed to the creditor under Section 56.

However, an assessment of unfairness under Section 140A isn’t limited to what happened immediately before or at the time a credit agreement and related agreement were entered into. The High Court held in *Patel* (which was recently approved by the Supreme Court in the case of *Smith*), that determining whether or not the relationship complained of was unfair had to be made “*having regard to the entirety of the relationship and all potentially relevant matters up to the time of making the determination*” – which was the date of the trial in the case of an existing credit relationship or otherwise the date the credit relationship ended.

The breadth of the unfair relationship test under Section 140A, therefore, is stark. But it isn’t a right afforded to a debtor simply because of a breach of a legal or equitable duty. As the Supreme Court said in *Plevin* (at paragraph 17):

“Section 140A [...] does not impose any obligation and is not concerned with the question whether the creditor or anyone else is in breach of a duty. It is concerned with [...] whether the creditor’s relationship with the debtor was unfair.”

Instead, it was said by the Supreme Court in *Plevin* that the protection afforded to debtors by Section 140A is the consequence of all of the relevant facts.

I have considered the entirety of the credit relationship between Mr W and the Lender, along with all of the circumstances of the complaint. When coming to my conclusion, and in carrying out my analysis, I have looked at:

1. The Supplier’s sales and marketing practices at the Time of Sale – which includes training material that I think is likely to be relevant to the sale;
2. The provision of information by the Supplier at the Time of Sale, including the contractual documentation and disclaimers made by the Supplier;

⁵ The Court of Appeal’s decision in *Scotland* was recently followed in *Smith*.

3. Evidence provided by both parties on what was likely to have been said and/or done at the Time of Sale; and
4. The inherent probabilities of the sale given its circumstances.

I have then considered the impact of these on the fairness of the credit relationship between Mr W and the Lender. And having done so, and having considered everything that has been submitted in response to my PD, I remain persuaded that the credit relationship between them was likely to have been rendered unfair to Mr W for the purposes of Section 140A. I will explain why.

The Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations

The Lender does not dispute, and I am satisfied, that Mr and Mrs W's Fractional Club 2 membership met the definition of a "timeshare contract" and was a "regulated contract" for the purposes of the Timeshare Regulations.

Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations prohibited the Supplier from marketing or selling Fractional Club 2 membership as an investment. This is what the provision said at the Time of Sale:

"A trader must not market or sell a proposed timeshare contract or long-term holiday product contract as an investment if the proposed contract would be a regulated contract."

But Mrs W, in her witness statement, and Mr W, in the Letter of Complaint submitted by the PR, say that the Supplier did exactly that at the Time of Sale. Mrs W says:

"The representatives advised that we should be purchasing more fractional points as this would be an investment that we could put towards our pension. As my husband was nearing retirement, they continually played on this saying that in 10 years we could sell the fractional investment and then we would be free of our contract with [the Supplier]. They even brought in a cleaner to advise how great and [sic] investment fractional points were. We were advised that more points could give us holiday anywhere and they pointed out Mexico and a holiday safari."

And this is repeated by the PR on behalf of Mr W, and further to the above, it said

"The timeshare product being sold was also represented as an investment. Our client/s were advised that they were investing in a fraction of a property that would be sold on a set date in the future. It was represented to our client/s that they would receive their purchase price back and in addition and in all likelihood a profit from the sale."

So, given the overall contents of Mrs W's statement, and what is said in Mr W's Letter of Complaint, Mr W alleges, therefore, that the Supplier breached Regulation 14(3) at the Time of Sale because:

1. There were two aspects to their Fractional Club 2 membership: holiday rights and a profit on the sale of the Allocated Property; and
2. They were told by the Supplier that they would get their money back or more during the sale of the Allocated Property.

The term "investment" is not defined in the Timeshare Regulations. In *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*, the parties agreed that, by reference to the decided authorities, "an investment is a transaction in which money or other property is laid out in the expectation or hope of financial gain or profit" at [56]. I will use the same definition.

Mr and Mrs W's share in the Allocated Property clearly, in my view, constituted an investment as it offered them the prospect of a financial return – whether or not, like all investments, that was more than what they first put into it. But, like I said in my PD, the fact that Fractional Club 2 membership included an investment element did not, itself, transgress the prohibition in Regulation 14(3). That provision prohibits the *marketing and selling* of a timeshare contract as an investment. It doesn't prohibit the mere existence of an investment element in a timeshare contract or prohibit the marketing and selling of such a timeshare contract *per se*.

In other words, and as the Lender pointed out in response to the PD, the Timeshare Regulations did not ban products such as the Fractional Club 2. They just regulated how such products were marketed and sold.

To conclude, therefore, that Fractional Club 2 membership was marketed or sold to Mr and Mrs W in breach of Regulation 14(3), I have to be persuaded that it was more likely than not that the Supplier marketed and/or sold membership to them as an investment, i.e. told them or led them to believe that Fractional Club 2 membership offered them the prospect of a financial gain (i.e., a profit) given the facts and circumstances of *this* complaint.

When I wrote the PD, I had not seen the specific sales documentation connected to this sale, but I had seen, in other similar complaints about sales of this product conducted at similar times, the standard documentation which the Supplier would have provided to purchasers, such as Mr and Mrs W. And in response to the PD the Lender has confirmed that these were indeed given to Mr and Mrs W at the Time of Sale, and they signed them as having been received. So, I am able to refer to them here.

So, I acknowledge, as I did in my PD, that there is evidence in this complaint that the Supplier made efforts to avoid specifically describing membership of the Fractional Club 2 as an 'investment' or quantifying to prospective purchasers, such as Mr and Mrs W, the financial value of their share in the net sales proceeds of the Allocated Property along with the investment considerations, risks and rewards attached to them. There were, for instance, disclaimers in the contemporaneous paperwork that state that Fractional Club 2 membership was not sold to Mr and Mrs W an investment.

For example, in the Member's Declaration document it states:

"We understand that the purchase of our Fraction is for the primary purpose of holidays and is not specifically for direct purposes of a trade in and that the Supplier makes no representation as to the future price or value of the Fraction."

And in the Information Statement, it states:

"Fractional Rights have been designed to be used and enjoyed and not bought with the expectation or necessity of future financial gain." And: "The purchase of Fractional Rights is for the primary purpose of holidays and is neither specifically for the direct purposes of a trade in nor as an investment in real estate. The Supplier makes no representation as to the future price or value of the Allocated Property or any Fractional Rights."

And:

"The Vendor, any sales or marketing agent and the Manager and their related businesses (a) are not licensed investment advisers authorised by the Financial Services Authority to provide investment or financial advice; (b) all information has been obtained solely from their own experiences as investors and is provided as general information only and as such it is not intended for use as a source of investment advice and (c) all

purchasers are advised to obtain competent advice from legal, accounting and investment advisers to determine their own specific investment needs; (D) no warranty is given as to any future values or returns in respect of an Allocated Property."

In response to my PD, the Lender says these disclaimers show there was at no stage any representation as to the future price or value of the fractional share, and the 'advice disclaimer' that is referenced above would lead the consumer to understand that the product was *not* being sold to them as an investment. I agree that the disclaimers' aim seems to be to ensure purchasers didn't rely on what they were told as investment advice, or a warranty as to the future value of the Allocated Property. So, I agree with the Lender, in that the disclaimer, on its own, cannot be construed as a representation that the Fractional Club is an investment. But I still regard its contents as more relevant to the sale of an investment than a holiday product, because it says those making the timeshare sale obtained information "*from their own experience as investors*" and recommends purchasers seek advice from "*investment advisers*" about their "*investment needs*". But in any event, the disclaimer doesn't seem to have been focussed on by Mr and Mrs W the Time of Sale, so doesn't advance either side's case anyway.

However, as I said in my PD, weighing up what happened in practice is, in my view, rarely as simple as looking at the contemporaneous paperwork. And there are a number of strands to Mr W's allegation that the Supplier breached Regulation 14(3) at the Time of Sale, including (1) that membership of the Fractional Club was expressly described as an "*investment*" in several different contexts and (2) that membership of the Fractional Club could make them a financial gain and/or would retain or increase in value.

So, for the avoidance of doubt following my PD, I have considered:

1. whether it is more likely than not that the Supplier, at the Time of Sale, sold or marketed membership of the Fractional Club as an investment, i.e. told Mr and Mrs W, or led them to believe during the marketing and/or sales process, that membership of the Fractional Club was an investment and/or offered them the prospect of a financial gain (i.e. a profit); and, in turn
2. whether the Supplier's actions constitute a breach of Regulation 14(3).

And for reasons I'll now come on to, given the facts and circumstances of this complaint, and having considered everything that the Lender has said in response to my PD, I think the answer to both of these questions is 'yes'.

How the Supplier marketed and sold the Fractional Club 2 membership

During the course of the Financial Ombudsman Service's work on complaints about the sale of timeshares, the Supplier has provided training material used to prepare its sales representatives – including:

1. A document called the 2013/2014 Sales Induction Training (the '2013/2014 Induction Training');
2. Screenshots of a Electronic Sales Aid (the 'ESA'); and
3. A document called the "FPOC2 Fly Buy Induction Training Manual" (the 'Fractional Club Training Manual')


Neither the 2013/2014 Induction Training nor the ESA I've seen included notes of any kind. However, the Fractional Club Training Manual includes very similar slides to those used in the ESA. And according to the Supplier, the Fractional Club Training Manual (or something

similar) was used by it to train its sales representatives at the Time of Sale. So, it seems to me that the Training Manual is reasonably indicative of:

- the training the Supplier's sales representatives would have got before selling Fractional Club membership; and
- how the sales representatives would have framed the Supplier's multimedia presentation (i.e., the ESA) during the sale of Fractional Club membership to prospective members – including Mr and Mrs W.

The “Game Plan” on page 23 of the Fractional Club Training Manual indicates that, of the first 12 to 25 minutes, most of that time would have been spent taking prospective members through a comparison between “renting” and “owning” along with how membership of the Fractional Club worked and what it was intended to achieve.

Page 32 of the Fractional Club Training Manual covered how the Supplier's sales representatives should address that comparison in more detail – indicating that they would have tried to demonstrate that there were financial advantages to owning property, over 10 years for example, rather than renting:



- Re-visit the idea of renting a house and talk them through the example of renting a home for £500 highlighting the fact of no return
- Refer to their decision to purchase a property as it made more financial sense to own than rent because, not only are they are building equity in their property, they can also continue to enjoy living in their home once it is paid for
- Ask: “if it cost a little more to own rather than rent would they be happy to pay the extra to own?” *(Increase amount of owning and continue to do this for a couple of times until they don't agree.*

CLOSE: So what you are telling me is that, as long as it's comfortably affordable, you would always choose to own rather than rent, is that correct?



LINK: Now let me show you the relevance this has when it comes to your holidays because what you are currently doing is ...

CLOSE:

Indeed, one of the advantages of ownership referred to in the slide above is that it makes more financial sense than renting because owners “*are building equity in their property*”. And as an owner's equity in their property is built over time as the value of the asset increases relative to the size of the mortgage secured against it, one of the advantages of ownership over renting was portrayed in terms that played on the opportunity ownership gave prospective members of the Fractional Club to accumulate wealth over time.

I acknowledge the point made by the Lender, that the slides don't include express reference to the "investment" benefit of ownership. But the description alludes to much the same concept. It was simply rephrased in the language of "building equity". And with that being the case, it seems to me that the approach to marketing Fractional Club membership was to strongly imply that 'owning' fractional points was a way of building wealth over time, similar to home ownership.

Page 33 of the Fractional Club Training Manual then moved the Supplier's sales representatives onto a cost comparison between "renting" holidays and "owning" them. Sales representatives were told to ask prospective members to tell them what they'd own if they just paid for holidays every year in contrast to spending the same amount of money to "own" their holidays – thus laying the groundwork necessary to demonstrating the advantages of Fractional Club membership:

- You are currently spending £xxxx on your holidays each year... (taken from survey)
- Confirm exactly what clients get for that money in terms of quality, people travelling and weeks
- Confirm the client will holiday for the next 10 years
- Explain total cost, with no inflation over a ten year period and ask what they own at the end of that period
- Compare spending the same money to own your holidays with better benefits, so that at the end of the ten years they would have received better value

CLOSE: So, looking at the two options which way makes more sense, to own or rent your holidays? (Get the answer "Owning") This is why so many people choose to holiday with ~~us~~.

LINK: Before I show you how the product works, I am just going to tell you how ~~we~~ started and where we are today.

CLOSE:

With the groundwork laid, sales representatives were then taken to the part of the ESA that explained how Fractional Club membership worked. And, on pages 41 and 42 of the Fractional Club Training Manual, this is what sales representatives were told to say to prospective members when explaining what a 'fraction' was:

*"FPOC = small piece of [...] World apartment which equals **ownership of bricks and mortar***

[...]

*Major benefit is the property is sold in nineteen years (**optimum period to cover peaks and troughs in the market**) when sold you will get your share of the proceeds of the sale*

SUMMARISE LAST SLIDE:

*FPOC equals a passport to fantastic holidays for 19 years **with a return at the end of that period**. When was the last time you went on holiday and **got some money back**? **How would you feel if there was an opportunity of doing that?***

[...]

*LINK: Many people join us every day and one of the main questions they have is “**how can we be sure our interests are taken care of for the full 19 years?**” As it is very important you understand how we ensure that, I am going to ask Paul to come over and explain this in more details for you.*

[...]

*“Handover: (Manager’s name) John and Mary love FPOC and have told me the best for them is.....**Would you mind explaining to them how their interest will be protected over the next 19 year[s]?**”*

(My emphasis added)

The Fractional Club Training Manual doesn’t give any immediate context to what the manager would have said to prospective members in answer to the question posed by the sales representative at the handover. Page 43 of the manual has the word “script” on it but otherwise it’s blank. However, after the Manual covered areas like the types of holiday and accommodation on offer to members, it went onto “resort management”, at which point page 61 said this:

“T/O will explain slides emphasising that they only pay a fraction of maintaining the entire property. It also ensures property is kept in peak condition to maximise the return in 19 years['] time.


[...]

*CLOSE: **I am sure you will agree with us that this management fee is an extremely important part of the equation as it ensures the property is maintained in pristine condition so at the end of the 19 year period, when the property is sold, you can get the maximum return.** So I take it, like our owners, there is nothing about the management fee that would stop you taking you holidays with us in the future?...”*

(My emphasis added)

By page 68 of the Fractional Training Manual, sales representatives were moved on to the holiday budget of prospective members. Included in the ESA were a number of holiday comparisons. It isn’t entirely clear to me what the relevant parts of the ESA were designed to show prospective members. But it seems that prospective members would have been shown that there was the prospect of a “return”.

For example, on page 69 of the Fractional Club Induction Training Manual, it included the following screenshots of the ESA along with the context the Supplier’s sales representatives were told to give to them:



[...]

"We also agreed that you would get nothing back from the travel agent at the end of this holiday period. Remember with your fraction at the end of the 19 year period, you will get some money back from the sale, so even if you only got a small part of your initial outlay, say £5,000 it would still be more than you would get renting your holidays from a travel agent, wouldn't it?"

I acknowledged in my PD, and I do again here, that the slides above set out a "return" that is less than the total cost of the holidays and the "initial outlay". But that was just an example and, given the way in which it was positioned in the Training Manual, the language did leave open the possibility that the return could be equal to if not more than the initial outlay.

Furthermore, the slides above represent Fractional Club membership as:

- (1) The right to receive holiday rights for 19 years whose market value significantly exceeds the costs to a Fractional Club member; plus
- (2) A significant financial return at the end of the membership term.

And to consumers (like Mr and Mrs W) who were looking to buy holidays anyway, the comparison the slides make between the costs of Fractional Club membership and the higher cost of buying holidays on the open market was likely to have suggested to them that the financial return was in fact an overall profit.

The Lender also argues that, given that a prospective Fractional Club 2 member could expect a financial return at the end of their membership term, it isn't surprising that attempts should be made by the Supplier to ensure that the amount in question is as high as it could be by maintaining the quality and condition of the property. It said that nobody would expect the amount returned at the end of the membership term to be as low as possible, or anything other than as much as possible. But the significant point, in the Lender's view, is that there was no comparison between the expected level of financial return and the initial outlay when purchasing membership.

And I acknowledge that, as I did in my PD. However, if I were to only concern myself with express efforts to quantify to Mr and Mrs W the financial value of the proprietary interest they were offered, I think that would involve taking too narrow a view of the prohibition against marketing and selling timeshares as an investment in Regulation 14(3).

When the Government consulted on the implementation of the Timeshare Regulations, it discussed what marketing or selling a timeshare as an investment might look like – saying that *'[a] trader must not market or sell a timeshare or [long-term] holiday product as an investment. For example, there should not be any inference that the cost of the contract would be recoupable at a profit in the future (see regulation 14(3)).'*⁶ And in my view that must have been correct because it would defeat the consumer-protection purpose of Regulation 14(3) if the concepts of marketing and selling a timeshare as an investment were interpreted too restrictively.

So, if a supplier *implied* to consumers that future financial returns (in the sense of possible profits) from a timeshare were a good reason to purchase it, I think its conduct was likely to have fallen foul of the prohibition against marketing or selling the product as an investment.

Indeed, if I'm wrong about that, I find it difficult to explain why, in paragraphs 77 and 78 followed by 99 and 100 of *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS* when, Mrs Justice Collins Rice said the following:

"[...] I endorse the observation made by Mr Jaffey KC, Counsel for BPF, that, whatever the position in principle, it is apparently a major challenge in practice for timeshare companies to market fractional ownership timeshares consistently with Reg.14(3). [...] Getting the governance principles and paperwork right may not be quite enough."

⁶ The Department for Business Innovation & Skills "Consultation on Implementation of EU Directive 2008/122/EC on Timeshare, Long-Term Holiday Products, Resale and Exchange Contracts (July 2010)".
<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a78d54ded915d0422065b2a/10-500-consultation-directive-timeshare-holiday.pdf>

The problem comes back to the difficulty in articulating the intrinsic benefit of fractional ownership over any other timeshare from an individual consumer perspective. [...] If it is not a prospect of getting more back from the ultimate proceeds of sale than the fractional ownership cost in the first place, what exactly is the benefit? [...] What the interim use or value to a consumer is of a prospective share in the proceeds of a postponed sale of a property owned by a timeshare company – one they have no right to stay in meanwhile – is persistently elusive.

“[...] although the point is more latent in the first decision than in the second, it is clear that both ombudsmen viewed fractional ownership timeshares – simply by virtue of the interest they confer in the sale proceeds of real property unattached to any right to stay in it, and the prospect they undoubtedly hold out of at least 'something back' – as products which are inherently dangerous for consumers. It is a concern that, however scrupulously a fractional ownership timeshare is marketed otherwise, its offer of a 'bonus' property right and a 'return' of (if not on) cash at the end of a moderate term of years may well taste and feel like an investment to consumers who are putting money, loyalty, hope and desire into their purchase anyway. Any timeshare contract is a promise, or at the very least a prospect, of long-term delight. [...] A timeshare-plus contract suggests a prospect of happiness-plus. And a timeshare plus 'property rights' and 'money back' suggests adding the gold of solidity and lasting value to the silver of transient holiday joy.”

And although I agree that Mrs W did not specify how much money they were led to believe they would receive when the Allocated Property was sold, she has said the Supplier told them “...*this would be a way to **make some money** for our retirement.*” [My emphasis]. She has not said that they were told they would *get some money back*, but has used the term *make some money*, which indicates they were led to believe it would be *more* than they put in.

I have considered the findings in *Prankard v Shawbrook Bank Limited* where the County Court found, that after considering the contractual documents and evidence regarding the training programme operated by the Supplier at the time, the product was not sold as an investment. But as that case was decided on its own facts, while I have read and considered it, it doesn't change my assessment of the evidence given the facts and circumstances of this complaint.

I think the Supplier's sales representatives were encouraged to make prospective Fractional Club members consider the advantages of owning something and view membership as an opportunity to build equity in an allocated property rather than simply paying for holidays in the usual way. That was likely to have been reinforced throughout the Supplier's sales presentations by the use of phrases such as “bricks and mortar” and notions that prospective members were building equity in something tangible that could make them some money at the end. I acknowledge that a phrase such as this, is in itself unobjectionable. But it wasn't to be considered on its own – it was used in the context of selling the Fractional Club 2. And as the Fractional Club Training Manual suggests that much would have been made of the possibility of prospective members maximising their returns (e.g., by pointing out that one of the major benefits of a 19-year membership term was that it was an optimum period of time to see out peaks and troughs in the market), I think the language used during the Supplier's sales presentations was likely to have been consistent with the idea that Fractional Club 2 membership was an investment.

The Lender, in response to my PD, said I needed to consider whether there was sufficiently clear, compelling evidence that the Fractional Club 2 was marketed and sold to Mr and Mrs W as an investment. But as I've said before, I must make my decision based on the balance of probability – that is what I think is most likely to have happened. And overall, as the slides I've referred to above seem to me to reflect the training the Supplier's sales

representatives would have got before selling Fractional Club membership and, in turn, how they would have probably framed the sale of the Fractional Club to prospective members, they indicate that, on the balance of probability, the Supplier's sales representative was likely to have led Mr and Mrs W to believe that membership of the Fractional Club was an investment that may lead to a financial gain (i.e., a profit) in the future. And Mrs W has said in her statement that this is how the Supplier positioned the Fractional Club to her and Mr W.

The Lender, in response to my PD, has said the statements from Mrs W upon which I have relied, contain mistakes and inconsistencies which is good reason to doubt their credibility. But I don't agree. The statements are generally consistent with each other and with what is written in the Letter of Complaint, and I have no reason to doubt their provenance. It is also understandable that there may be inconsistencies in the contents of the witness statements. They were, after all, written some time after the sale in question, so it would be surprising if there weren't some mistakes as memories fade over time.

And although some details may be wrong, such as where one of the sales took place, and whilst taking all of this into account, I remain satisfied that I am able to place weight on, and rely on, the content of the statements, whilst remaining cognisant of any possible material errors. And whilst I accept it is *possible* that Mr and Mrs W would have purchased the Fractional Club 2 membership even if the Supplier hadn't led them to believe that there was the prospect of a financial gain from the membership, I don't think that's *probable* based on what I've seen.

And with that being the case, I remain of the opinion as set out in my PD - I don't find Mrs W either implausible or hard to believe when she says:

"The representatives advised that we should be purchasing more fractional points as this would be an investment that we could put towards our pension. As my husband was nearing retirement, they continually played on this saying that in 10 years we could sell the fractional investment and then we would be free of our contract with [the Supplier]. They even brought in a cleaner to advise how great and [sic] investment fractional points were."

The Lender has also questioned the last line of this section of Mrs W's testimony as being untrue, and so calling into question how much reliance I can place on it. But I find it hard to understand why Mrs W would have been so specific about what happened here without it being based on the events as she remembers them. And although the Lender has said that few of the cleaners were able to speak English, this doesn't mean that what Mrs W has described didn't happen.

So, I think it's likely that the Time of Sale, Mr and Mrs W were led by the Supplier to believe that their purchase of Fractional Club 2 gave them the prospect of a financial gain. And for that reason, I think the Supplier breached Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations.

Was the credit relationship between the Lender and the Consumer rendered unfair?

Having found that the Supplier breached Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations at the Time of Sale, I now need to consider what impact that breach had on the fairness of the credit relationship between Mr W and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement.

As the Supreme Court's judgment in *Plevin* makes clear, it does not automatically follow that regulatory breaches create unfairness for the purposes of Section 140A. Such breaches and their consequences (if there are any) must be considered in the round, rather than in a narrow or technical way.

I am also mindful of what HHJ Waksman QC (as he then was) and HHJ Worster had to say in *Carney* and *Kerrigan* (respectively) on causation.

In *Carney*, HHJ Waksman QC said the following in paragraph 51:

"[...] In cases of wrong advice and misrepresentation, it would be odd if any relief could be considered if they did not have at least some material impact on the debtor when deciding whether or not to enter the agreement. [...] in a case like the one before me, if in fact the debtors would have entered into the agreement in any event, this must surely count against a finding of unfair relationship under s140A. [...]"

And in *Kerrigan*, HHJ Worster said this in paragraphs 213 and 214:

*"[...] The terms of section 140A(1) CCA do not impose a requirement of "causation" in the sense that the debtor must show that a breach caused a loss for an award of substantial damages to be made. The focus is on the unfairness of the relationship, and the court's approach to the granting of relief is informed by that, rather than by a demonstration that a particular act caused a particular loss. Section 140A(1) provides only that the court **may** make an order **if** it determines that the relationship is unfair to the debtor. [...]"*

"[...] There is a link between (i) the failings of the creditor which lead to the unfairness in the relationship, (ii) the unfairness itself, and (iii) the relief. It is not to be analysed in the sort of linear terms which arise when considering causation proper. The court is to have regard to all the relevant circumstances when determining whether the relationship is unfair, and the same sort of approach applies when considering what relief is required to remedy that unfairness. [...]"

So, it seems to me that, if I am to conclude that a breach of Regulation 14(3) led to a credit relationship between Mr W and the Lender that was unfair to him and warranted relief as a result, whether the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3)⁷ led them to enter into the Purchase Agreement and Mr W into the Credit Agreement is an important consideration.

On my initial reading of the Letter of Complaint and Mrs W's statements, I thought that the prospect of a financial gain from Fractional Club 2 membership was an important and motivating factor when they decided to go ahead and 'upgrade' their Fractional Club. And I remain of that opinion now. That doesn't mean they were not interested in holidays - their own timeshare purchase and usage history demonstrates that they quite clearly were, and that is not surprising given the nature of the product at the centre of this complaint.

But as I said in my PD, Mrs W says (plausibly in my view) that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to them at the Time of Sale as something that offered them more than just holiday rights – it offered them the prospect of making money that they could use towards their retirement. So, on the balance of probabilities, and whilst taking everything into account, I think their purchase was motivated by their increased share in the new Allocated Property and them making money from its sale, as that increased share was one of the defining features that marked it apart from their existing fractional membership.

I again acknowledge, as I did in my PD, that Mr and Mrs W gained additional holiday rights when they 'upgraded' their fractional membership at the Time of Sale. And it is clear that holidays were important to them. But, as I've said, I think the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) was material to the decision they ultimately made. Neither Mr W in the Letter of Complaint, or Mrs W in her statements, have said or suggested, for example, that they would

⁷ (which, having taken place during its antecedent negotiations with Mr W, is covered by Section 56 of the CCA, falls within the notion of "any other thing done (or not done) by, or on behalf of, the creditor" for the purposes of 140(1)(c) of the CCA and deemed to be something done by the Lender)

have pressed ahead with the purchase in question had the Supplier not led them to believe that the upgraded Fractional Club 2 membership was an appealing investment opportunity. And as Mr W faced the prospect of borrowing and repaying a substantial sum of money while subjecting himself to long-term financial commitments, had they not been encouraged by the prospect of a financial gain from membership of the Fractional Club 2, I have not seen enough to persuade me that they would have pressed ahead with their purchase regardless. And with that being the case, I think the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) was material to the decision they ultimately made. This is the basis upon which I have decided that the credit relationship between Mr W and the Lender was unfair to him.

As I've said, given that it was, on the balance of probability, likely that the sale of Fractional Club 2 was pitched as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3), and I think it likely that the potential to make some money (i.e. a profit) for their retirement was an important driver for Mr and Mrs W in their purchase of the Fractional Club 2 membership, it follows that the associated credit relationship under the Credit Agreement with the Lender was rendered unfair to Mr W as a result.

Conclusion

Given the facts and circumstances of this complaint, I think the Lender participated in and perpetuated an unfair credit relationship with Mr W under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement for the purposes of Section 140A. And with that being the case, taking everything into account, I think it is fair and reasonable that I uphold this complaint.

Putting things right

The Lender, in its response to my PD, made no comment regarding how I thought it should calculate and pay fair compensation to the estate of Mr W. So, having considered everything afresh, I see no reason to depart from what I set out in my PD which was as follows:

Having found that Mr and Mrs W would not have agreed to purchase Fractional Club 2 membership at the Time of Sale were it not for the breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations by the Supplier (as deemed agent for the Lender), and the impact of that breach meaning that, in my view, the relationship between the Lender and Mr W was unfair under section 140A of the CCA, I think it would be fair and reasonable to put the estate of Mr W back in the position it would have been in had Mr and Mrs W not purchased the Fractional Club 2 membership (i.e., not entered into the Purchase Agreement), and therefore Mr W not entered into the Credit Agreement.

This means, in effect, that the estate of Mr W needs to be returned to the position it would now be in had Mr and Mrs W retained their Fractional Club 1 membership. This is on the proviso that the estate of Mr W agrees to assign to the Lender the 1,073 fractional points which are solely related to their Fractional Club 2 membership, or hold them on trust for the Lender if that can be achieved.

Here's what I think needs to be done to compensate the estate of Mr W with that being the case – whether or not a court would award such compensation:

- (1) The Lender should refund to the estate of Mr W the repayments made to it under the Credit Agreement.
- (2) In addition to (1), the Lender should also refund the Fractional Club 2 annual management charges Mr and Mrs W had to pay, but this refund should only reflect the amount over and above what they would have had to pay under their original membership*.

- (3) The Lender can deduct
 - i. The value of any promotional giveaways that Mr and Mrs W used or took advantage of; and
 - ii. The market value of the holidays** Mr and Mrs W took using their Fractional Points (if any).(the 'Net Repayments')
- (4) Simple interest⁸ at 8% per annum should be added to each of the Net Repayments from the date each one was made until the date the Lender settles this complaint.
- (5) The Lender should remove any adverse information recorded on the late Mr W's credit files in connection with the Credit Agreement.

*Mr and Mrs W upgraded their original timeshare when they purchased the Fractional Club 2 membership. They originally had 747 fractional points which were rolled into their new membership, and they would have been responsible for paying the management fees associated with that previous membership in any event. So, it would not be fair and reasonable for the Lender to be responsible for repaying all of the management fees associated with Fractional Club 2, only the additional fees.

It is impossible to say what the future management fees relating to their original membership would have been. A fair solution, in my view, is for the Lender to refund to the estate of Mr W the management charges that Mr and Mrs W actually paid after 25 March 2014 that relate only to their additional 1,073 fractional points. This equates to 59%⁹ of the 1,820 points Mr and Mrs W actually ended up with. So, in addition to the Net Repayments above:

- (1) The Lender should refund 59% of the annual management charge(s) paid by Mr and Mrs W from 25 March 2014 onwards (if any) less a deduction for any holiday¹⁰ they took using the fractional points relating to Fractional Club.
- (2) Simple interest at 8% per annum should be added to this amount from the date each charge was paid until the date of settlement.

It is possible that the Supplier might pursue the estate of Mr W for other costs in addition to the annual management charges arising from the Fractional Club 2 membership, so there is the possibility of continuing detriment that I think needs addressing. So, in keeping with what I've said above, the Lender should indemnify the estate of Mr W against 59% of any other liabilities accruing from 25 March 2014 onwards that result from Mr and Mrs W's ownership of Fractional Rights.

** I recognise that it can be difficult to reasonably and reliably determine the market value of holidays when they were taken a long time ago and might not have been available on the open market. So, if it isn't practical or possible to determine the market value of the holidays Mr and Mrs W took using their Fractional Points, deducting the relevant annual management charges (that correspond to the year(s) in which one or more holidays were taken) payable under the Purchase Agreement seems to me to be a practical and proportionate alternative in order to reasonably reflect their usage.

This, together with what I've said in the paragraphs above will achieve, as closely as I can in this complaint, the same financial position for the estate of Mr W as if Mr and Mrs W had

⁸ HM Revenue & Customs may require the Lender to take off tax from this interest. If that's the case, the Lender must give the consumer a certificate showing how much tax it's taken off if they ask for one.

⁹ Rounded to the nearest whole number.

¹⁰ See Section (3) (ii) above

never joined the Fractional Club 2 in the first place.

My final decision

I uphold this complaint against Shawbrook Bank Limited and require it to calculate and pay fair compensation to the estate of Mr W as set out above.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask the estate of Mr W to accept or reject my decision before 1 January 2025.

Chris Riggs
Ombudsman