

The complaint

Mr G complains that Propel Holdings (UK) Limited trading as Quid Market irresponsibly provided him with loans.

What happened

Over a period of about two and a half years Quid Market provided the following loans to Mr G.

Loan no:	Start date	Loan amount	Term	Repayment	End date
1	22/01/2022	£300	4 months	£127.86	27/05/2022
2	11/07/2022	£500	5 months	£167.71	14/07/2022
3	31/12/2023	£500	6 months	£162.07	26/04/2024
4	31/05/2024	£400	5 months	£141.07	Outstanding*

*This loan was outstanding at the time this complaint was made.

Mr G complained to Quid Market through a third-party representative about its decision to lend each of the loans. Quid Market responded in its final response letter of 8 April 2025, agreeing to uphold Mr G's complaint about loans 2 and 4. Quid Market offered to refund interest, fees and charges from both loans. The offer also included removing loans 2 and 4 from Mr G's credit file.

Mr G was unsatisfied with the offer from Quid Market, so he referred his complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service where it was looked at one of our investigators. Our investigator didn't think Quid Market should have lent loans 1 and 3 either and so recommended that Mr G's complaint about those loans should be upheld as well.

Quid Market agreed with the investigators opinion about loan 1 but didn't agree with the recommendation to uphold loan 3. Quid Market says its checks for this loan were sufficient and those checks showed Mr G could afford the loan, so it didn't agree with the investigators conclusions that those checks showed Mr G couldn't afford loan 3.

As the complaint remains unresolved, it has been passed to me, an ombudsman 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.

There has been a resolution on loans 1, 2 and 4 as Quid Market agrees it shouldn't have lent Mr G those loans. The only loan left to consider is loan 3, and this decision focusses on whether Quid Market did anything wrong when it lent Mr G loan 3.

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.

Quid Market is aware of its obligations as a lender as explained in the regulator's handbook, so I don't intend to go into all the details about his duty. In summary, Quid Market is required to take reasonable steps to ensure that it didn't lend irresponsibly. There isn't a prescriptive level of checks to ensure responsible lending and in the early stages of a lending relationship, I think less thorough checks might be reasonable and proportionate.

But certain factors might point to the fact that Quid Market should fairly and reasonably have done more to establish that any lending was sustainable for the consumer. These factors include:

- the *lower* a consumer's income (reflecting that it could be more difficult to make any loan repayments to a given loan amount from a lower level of income);
- the *higher* the amount due to be repaid (reflecting that it could be more difficult to meet a higher repayment from a particular level of income);
- the *greater* the number and frequency of loans, and the longer the period of time during which a customer has been given loans (reflecting the risk that repeated refinancing may signal that the borrowing had become, or was becoming, unsustainable).

Quid Market has provided information about the checks it carried out before lending loan 3. It says it checked Mr G's income and committed living expenses, it also searched Mr G's credit file and has provided details of the outcome of its search.

Quid Market found that Mr G's monthly income for the time of loan 3 was £2,100, it says his housing payment was £430, and the rest of his monthly living costs were £440. Quid Market says it worked out Mr G's credit commitments as £790 and based on this, Mr G was left with sufficient disposable income to repay £162.07 towards this loan over the term.

I've thought about Quid Market's checks, and I think given that this was Mr G's first loan after more than a year of repaying loan 2 and the repayment amount represented a small portion of Mr G's income, Quid Market's checks weren't unreasonable. I've also considered whether there were any concerns from its search into Mr G's credit file that should have prompted further checks. Mr G didn't have a default recorded within the last twelve months and there was no recent adverse information that suggested Mr G was struggling at the time. However, having looked at Mr G's credit commitments at the time, the figures Quid Market has used for his credit commitments don't represent what he was paying monthly.

From what I can see, Mr G was repaying a loan for £127 monthly, he had two hire purchase agreements he was paying around £603 towards. Mr G also had a historic default he was paying £10 into, his revolving credit balance was around £9,872, if he was repaying 3% of this monthly, he'd be paying around £296. Mr G also had two mortgages in his name which he held jointly with another party, so Mr G was responsible for half of the payments which was around £683.

Taking all these payments into account against Mr G's income of £2,100, he'd have been left with around £30 after he made the monthly repayment of £162.07 for loan 3. This left Mr G in a position where he was most likely going to struggle to meet his repayments when they fell due over the term of the loan. In this circumstance, Quid Market shouldn't have lent to Mr G because he couldn't afford it.

Quid Market has lent all four loans to Mr G when it shouldn't have so it needs to put things right.

Putting things right – what Quid Market needs to do

- Add up the total repayments Mr G has made and deduct these from the total amount of money he received.
 - a) If this results in Mr G having paid more than he received, any overpayments should be refunded along with 8% simple interest (calculated from the date the overpayments were made until the date of settlement) †.
 - b) If any capital balance remains outstanding, then Quid Market should work with Mr G to agree an affordable and suitable payment plan.
- Quid Market should remove any adverse information in relation to all the loans from Mr G's credit file once he has fully repaid the capital borrowed.

† HM Revenue & Customs requires Quid Market to take off tax from this interest. Quid Market must give Mr G a certificate showing how much tax it's taken off if he asks for it.

Did Quid Market act unfairly/unreasonably in some other way?

I've also considered whether Quid Market acted unfairly or unreasonably in some other way, including whether its relationship with Mr G might have been viewed as unfair by a court under s.140A Consumer Credit Act 1974. However, I'm satisfied the redress I have directed above results in fair compensation for Mr G in the circumstances of his complaint. I'm satisfied, based on what I've seen, that no additional award would be appropriate in this case.

My final decision

For the reasons given above, I uphold Mr G's complaint and direct Propel Holding (UK) Limited trading as Quid Market to put things right as set out above.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr G to accept or reject my decision before 12 December 2025.

Oyetola Oduola
Ombudsman