

The complaint

Mr J complains that Amplifi Capital (U.K.) Limited trading as Reevo Money ("Reevo") lent to him without doing proper affordability checks. If it had it would have seen he already had loans and credit cards meaning he could not afford the Reevo loan.

What happened

Mr J took one loan for £5,000 on 4 August 2023 over 36 months. Mr J told Reevo it was for debt consolidation. The monthly repayments were scheduled to be £221 (rounded figure). The last one was due to be just over £357. The total amount repayable was a little over £8,089. Mr J got into arrears and currently the loan is being repaid through a third party debt management plan. This commenced October 2023 at around £58 a month. A default was reported on this loan to the credit agencies in June 2024. The debt was assigned to a third party debt purchaser in April 2025. The outstanding sum at that date was around £4,140.

Mr J complained and received Reevo's final response letter in late December 2024. It was referred to the Financial Ombudsman Service where one of our investigators thought that the complaint should be upheld. Reevo disagreed and made submissions around the loan being taken by Mr J for consolidation of existing debt.

The unresolved complaint was passed to me to decide. When I had reviewed the complaint I asked Reevo for more information to clarify matters and to gain some more information. On 12 September 2025 I issued a provisional decision giving reasons why I planned not to uphold the complaint.

Mr J has responded which I will address later in the decision. For ease of reading the provisional decision is duplicated here:

What I provisionally decided on 12 September 2025 – and why

I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint. We've set out our general approach to complaints about unaffordable/irresponsible lending - including all of the relevant rules, guidance, and good industry practice - on our website.

Reevo needed to make sure it didn't lend irresponsibly. In practice, what this means it needed to carry out proportionate checks to be able to understand whether Mr J could afford to repay any credit it provided.

Our website sets out what we typically think about when deciding whether a lender's checks were proportionate. Generally, we think it's reasonable for checks to be less thorough – in terms of how much information is gathered and what is done to verify it – in the early stages of a lending relationship.

But we might think more needed to be done if, for example, a borrower's income was low or the amount lent was high. And the longer the lending relationship goes on, the greater the risk of it becoming unsustainable and the borrower experiencing financial difficulty. So, we'd expect a firm to be able to show that it didn't continue to facilitate a customer's loans irresponsibly.

Reevo's records indicated that on 9 May 2023 Mr J had asked it for a £6,000 loan repayable over 36 months which had been declined. Reevo has confirmed with me that the reason for the decline was that it checked his income and was not content with what he had said.

For the August 2023 application, Mr J informed Reevo that he was employed full time and earned £38,000 a year. Reevo calculated this as £2,432 a month after tax. Bank statements Reevo obtained from Mr J after he'd complained show that his salary varied but even the lowest figure was £2,485 in a month (after tax) which was a higher figure than the one Reevo had used (the after tax figure) when assessing him for his loan. During the complaint investigation Reevo has pointed out the '*Income from statements - £2,485.60 £2,631.82 £2961.71*'.

So, I consider that and if Reevo had double checked using the figures which actually credited his bank account then it would have been satisfied that he earned more than the £2,432 it used in its assessment before lending. The average income figure over the three months leading up to the August 2023 application was £2,692.

Reevo carried out a credit search. This showed that Mr J owed just under £45,000 (part of which was a car finance agreement) in total and had been in a debt management plan (DMP) for a loan until July 2020 – that loan had defaulted in November 2017 and had been paid off in July 2020. So, he had adverse credit data but likely would have been viewed as historic as Mr J was applying for this loan three years later.

Mr J had two active telecoms accounts (one was costing around £28 a month), a current account with an overdraft, a bank loan, a credit card with a £1,902 balance on a £2,250 limit and no repayment issues. Mr J had a credit/store card which had started in November 2022 with the same credit limit and a similar balance on it and no payment issues. Mr J had a several further credit or store cards and with lower balances and no repayment issues. All the credit/store card balances added up to around £7,986 which at the usual 3% minimum repayment monthly cost would have worked out to have been around £240. Some of the more recent accounts were within the individual card's promotional period which may have meant no interest was charged. I come back to this £240 minimum repayment figure later in the provisional decision.

Mr J had a hire purchase (HP) account which had started February 2022, with a 59 month term at £213 a month and there were no repayment issues. The outstanding balance on that was £9,361.

Mr J had taken a loan in February 2023 for £8,000 the repayment for which was £309 and was due to last 36 months. There were a few other entries for settled accounts and one of which indicated that it looked to have been in the same DMP. Mr J's car insurance accounts (past and present) had registered as well.

Using these figures provided in that credit search then the minimum repayment for the cards of £240 a month, plus the telecoms account of £28, plus the HP and the outstanding loan then the total Mr J was paying would have been around £790 a month on my calculations.

Reevo has used a monthly figure of £878 for all Mr J's credit commitment costs and the higher figure could be because Reevo may have used a higher percentage figure for the cards minimum monthly repayment. But I'm not going to consider it wrong of Reevo to have used a higher figure than may have been the case as it builds in a level of margin for error.

I have received confirmation from Reevo recently that it used ONS figures for Mr J's general expenditure of £811, rent of £435 a month. So, these figures plus the £878 a month it used for Mr J's credit commitments all added up to £2,124 a month.

However, because Mr J had applied to Reevo a few months before he asked for this August 2023 loan, and it had been declined, I think that it ought to have done more than use ONS figures for Mr J's general living expenditure figures. I have copies of Mr J's bank statements and I have reviewed all of June 2023 and all of July 2023. Mr J's regular expenditure across both months were as follows:

Rent, council tax, energy bill, TV licence, broadband and mobile,	£856
Two insurances + trade union fee	£100
DVLA and car finance payment	£225
Credit commitments to four loans (including a credit union)	£824

credit/store cards - the 3% minimum on the total would have been

£240

Total £2,245.

This demonstrates that the ONS figures were pretty accurate as the total expenditure Reevo had used for Mr J had been £2,124 and I get to £2,245.

Mr J's average income was £2,797 for June and July 2023. And so, I think that the loan repayments of £221 a month looked affordable. He'd still have had about £300 left over.

Added to which, I accept Reevo's point that he told it he was applying for the £5,000 to consolidate debt. And so, it is feasible that Mr J was going to reduce or consolidate some of the repayments I've outlined earlier and seen on his bank statements with this cash loan.

This is the end of the duplicated provisional decision.

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.

Reevo has not responded to the provisional decision. Mr J has. Mr J has rejected my findings and has said:

Firstly Amplifi Capital should ask why my income are different every month and what is my monthly salary excluded overtime. Overtime is not guaranteed in my workplace. Usually over the summer time to cover holidays. And this was about £2400 at the time.

Secondly a lot of transactions to [P] should be red flag for them and they never asked what this transaction is. This was gambling transactions.

I did indicate that Reevo ought to have obtained Mr J's bank account statements for the period leading up to his loan application in August 2023 before lending. I reviewed the full months for June and July 2023 to see what it is that Reevo would have discovered if it had done that additional check.

On the income point – there's no reason it should consider it had to further check Mr J's income having seen the figures credit his account. There's nothing to suggest that Reevo would have known, or ought to have known, that during the summer months he did overtime at work. So, I do not agree with this contention.

As for the gambling point, I have checked the original email of complaint sent by Mr J to Reevo plus Mr J's complaint form sent to us and there's been no mention of gambling. This is the first time it has been mentioned and Mr J has sent to me no evidence of any gambling transactions.

Having said that I saw on Mr J's statements the multiple payments to that particular organisation to which Mr J refers, and which I have abbreviated to P. I thought about them at the time and before I issued my provisional decision. But as they were Direct Debits it did not seem likely that these were transactions to purchase something or to carry out any sort of compulsive spending activity. And as Mr J had made no mention of this it all either to Reevo or to us then it seemed unlikely.

And having thought about it again, reviewing these bank statements before lending would not, in my view, have prompted Reevo to think or assume that this indicated compulsive spending or gambling. I reject Mr J's contention that they would have been a 'red flag'.

Mr J's response to my provisional decision does not persuade me to alter my view. I don't uphold the complaint.

My final decision

My final decision is that I do not uphold the complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr J to accept or reject my decision before 24 October 2025.

Rachael Williams
Ombudsman