

The complaint

Miss B complains that PROPEL HOLDINGS (UK) LIMITED trading as Quidmarket treated her unfairly during a period of financial difficulty, and that it set up a payment plan on her loan without her agreement.

What happened

In August 2023, Miss B took out a loan with Quidmarket. The loan was for £500 to be repaid over a period of six months. After making an initial payment, Miss B fell into financial difficulties and wasn't able to pay. The loan was placed on hold until May 2024. Miss B told Quidmarket that she wasn't receiving any income or benefits, and was only receiving £100 per week from her partner to live on. Quidmarket asked Miss B to pay £10 per week.

This was agreed, and payments were made weekly until July 2024 when Miss B's situation worsened. She said she could only afford to make token payments, and asked Quidmarket to consider writing the loan off. Quidmarket asked if Miss B could change her payments from £10 per week to £10 per month. Miss B didn't agree to this, and said she was waiting to see what benefits she would be entitled to. The payment plan was set up anyway, and a payment was taken in August 2024.

Miss B made a complaint. She was unhappy that Quidmarket had set up a payment plan without her agreement despite being aware of her financial difficulties. She also said she made it clear previously that she had no income, and only agreed to make weekly payments because she felt pressured to do so. She said Quidmarket had never checked to make sure the payments were affordable for her, and made an already difficult situation worse. She asked that the remaining balance be written off and that any adverse information be removed from her credit file.

Quidmarket agreed it hadn't treated Miss B fairly. It said it hadn't followed the correct process for supporting customers in financial difficulties, and that it shouldn't have set up a payment plan without her agreement. It offered to write off the remaining loan balance and to refund the most recent £10 payment. It later agreed to refund all of the other payments Miss B had made towards the loan (£272.34) and to remove the loan entirely from her credit file.

The complaint was referred to this service. While Miss B was happy with the actions Quidmarket had taken to put things right, she didn't think it had fully recognised the impact its actions had on her or the unnecessary stress and inconvenience it had caused. One of our Investigators considered the complaint, but thought Quidmarket had done enough to put things right. Miss B didn't agree, and asked that the complaint be referred to an Ombudsman for a final decision. So, it's been passed to me to decide.

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.

I'd like to assure both parties that I've read and considered all of the information they've

provided in reaching my decision. I recognise that I've summarised Miss B's concerns in significantly less detail than she has. This isn't intended as a discourtesy, but simply reflects the informal nature of my role in deciding what a reasonable outcome is. If I've not reflected or specifically addressed something that's been said it's not because I didn't see it – but because I didn't deem it relevant to the crux of the complaint. My decision will focus on what I consider to be the key points of the complaint.

I'd first like to thank Miss B for sharing details of her circumstances. It's clear she's been through a difficult time, and she has my sincere sympathy for this. It's not in dispute that Quidmarket made mistakes here. It asked Miss B to make weekly payments towards the loan when it ought to have known she couldn't afford to, and it set up a monthly payment plan without her agreement. It also could have done more to communicate clearly and effectively with Miss B. What's left for me to decide is whether Quidmarket has done enough to put things right, taking the relevant circumstances into account.

I don't doubt that Miss B felt significant pressure to make payments towards the loan, especially as she'd been told a default would be registered if no payment plan was agreed. Based on what she's said, I'm satisfied these payments made what was already a difficult situation worse for her. This naturally would have caused stress and worry for Miss B – and finding out later that a new payment plan had been set up without her agreement would have added to this.

Quidmarket wrote off the remaining balance of the loan and refunded the payments Miss B has made. Effectively, this means Miss B has had the full benefit of the funds Quidmarket lent to her (£500) without needing to pay those funds back. The loan balance was legitimately owed by Miss B, and I wouldn't necessarily have required Quidmarket to write it off had it not already agreed to do so. The amount it refunded to her is also, most likely, more than I'd have awarded in compensation had Quidmarket not already paid this. So, in these circumstances, I think the outcome it reached is a fair one. It also took steps to ensure there's no further impact on Miss B by removing the loan from her credit file – which I find reasonable.

I appreciate Miss B feels Quidmarket hasn't fully recognised the impact its errors had on her. But my role is to decide a fair outcome in the circumstances of the complaint – and I'm satisfied Quidmarket has done enough to put things right for Miss B in this case. So, I don't require it to do anything more.

My final decision

My final decision is that I don't uphold Miss B's complaint about PROPEL HOLDINGS (UK) LIMITED trading as Quidmarket.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss B to accept or reject my decision before 14 October 2025.

Stephen Billings
Ombudsman