

The complaint

Miss M complains that Amplifi Capital (U.K.) Limited trading as Reevo Money (“Reevo Money”) irresponsibly lent a personal loan to her.

She says she was in a cycle of debt and Reevo Money should have asked more questions about her financial situation. Had they done so, they would have seen she was at the top end of her credit limits with other credit providers and was in her overdraft.

What happened

Reevo Money provided Miss M with a loan of £2,000 in April 2024. The loan was due to be repaid with an initial payment of £89.64, 34 subsequent monthly payments of £81.06 and a final payment of £156.25.

One of our investigators reviewed what Miss M and Reevo Money had told us. And he thought that Reevo Money hadn’t done anything wrong or treated Miss M unfairly. So, he didn’t recommend that Miss M’s complaint should be upheld.

Miss M disagreed and asked for an ombudsman to look at her complaint.

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.

We’ve explained on our website how we handle complaints about unaffordable and irresponsible lending. I’ve used this approach to help me decide Miss M’s complaint.

Reevo Money needed to ensure they didn’t lend irresponsibly. In practice, what this means is Reevo Money needed to carry out proportionate checks to be able to understand whether Miss M could afford to repay before providing this loan.

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 they gather and what they do to verify it in the early stages of a lending relationship.

But we might think a lender needed to do more 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 lender to be able to show they didn’t continue to lend to a customer irresponsibly.

Reevo Money says it lent to Miss M after she provided details of her monthly income. They say they cross-checked this against information on credit searches they carried out and all this information showed Miss M could afford to make the repayments she was committing to.

Miss M says though that her existing indebtedness and financial position meant Reevo Money shouldn’t have lent to her.

This was Miss M's first loan with Reevo Money, and it wasn't, in my view, a particularly large loan given Miss M's income at the time. Reevo Money has sent us an output of the income and expenditure information they obtained and considered at the time of Miss M's application as well as a record of the results of their credit searches.

Reevo Money's credit searches show that Miss M did have existing debts. But crucially, these also show that Miss M was managing these relatively well and there was no significant adverse information such as defaults or county court judgements. And after payments for Miss M's active credit commitments were deducted from her income and the expenditure Reevo Money considered, she did appear to have had enough funds left over to cover the low monthly payments to this loan.

I do understand, from what Miss M has said and from the evidence shown on her bank statements, that her actual circumstances weren't reflected in the information Reevo Money obtained and then considered at the time. But Reevo Money could only make a reasonable decision based on the information they had available at the time. As this was a first loan with low monthly repayments, and nothing that showed that Miss M had struggled to make payments to her existing creditors, and the fact that Miss M said she intended to use the loan to consolidate existing debt, I'm satisfied Reevo Money was entitled to believe Miss M could afford to make her payments,

I accept it's likely, although I can't be certain, that Reevo Money might have reached a different conclusion on whether to give Miss M the loan had they seen her bank statements. But given the circumstances here, the lack of obvious inconsistencies and any indication that Miss M was struggling financially, I don't think that reasonable and proportionate checks would have extended into Reevo Money obtaining Miss M's bank statements.

As such, I don't think Reevo Money did anything wrong when deciding to lend to Miss M. In my view, they carried out reasonable and proportionate checks to show that the low monthly repayments were affordable. I'm satisfied that it wasn't unfair for Reevo Money to have provided this loan to Miss M.

Finally, I've also considered whether the lending relationship between Reevo Money and Miss M might have been unfair to Miss M under section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974.

However, for the reasons I've explained, I'm not persuaded that Reevo Money irresponsibly lent to Miss M or treated her unfairly bearing in mind all the circumstances. And I haven't seen anything to suggest that section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 or anything else would, given the facts of this complaint, lead to a different outcome here.

Overall, and based on the available evidence, I've not been persuaded that Reevo Money acted unfairly when providing Miss M with this loan. So, I won't be upholding this complaint. I appreciate that Miss M will be disappointed with my decision. But I hope at least she'll understand the reasons for it.

My final decision

For the reasons I've explained above, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss M to accept or reject my decision before 22 August 2025.

Daniel Picken

Ombudsman