

## The complaint

LRUK (RETAIL) Limited trading as La Redoute provided Miss M with a catalogue account. She says the credit was provided irresponsibly.

## What happened

Miss M complains about the lending decisions below:

Date	Event	Credit limit
June 2017	Account opening	£110
November 2017	Credit limit increase	£130
May 2019	Credit limit increase	£230

The details of this complaint are well-known to both parties, so I won't repeat them again here. The facts aren't in dispute, so I'll focus on giving the reasons for my 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.

Having considered everything, I'm not upholding Miss M's complaint. I'll explain my reasoning below:

We've set out our general approach to complaints about unaffordable or irresponsible lending on our website and I've taken this into account in deciding Miss M's case.

I've decided the credit was provided fairly because:

- I don't think the checks LRUk did before providing the credit were reasonable and proportionate given the credit limit it offered and what it knew about Miss M's financial situation.
- If LRUk had done proportionate checks, I don't think it's likely these would have shown it was unfair to provide the credit to Miss M.
- Based on the information Miss M provided about her circumstances at the time, there was nothing to suggest she was likely to be unable to sustainably repay what she was being lent.
- Given the relatively low credit limit complained about, I don't think LRUk treated Miss M unfairly by not verifying her income and expenditure. In the absence of information suggesting Miss M was reliant on credit or struggling to manage her accounts, I consider LRUk having a better understanding of her open accounts and how they were being managed would have been reasonable. And the bank statements provided by Miss M suggested she was making regular payments towards a historic debt, a short-term loan, and two other catalogue accounts. The

payments were low, suggesting they had modest credit limits.

- I've noted what Miss M has said about the defaults being reported on her credit file. However, these were issued between two to four years before LRUk's first lending decision. So, I consider they would reasonably be deemed as historic by the time she applied for the account – in turn, they alone wouldn't have been sufficient to conclude further borrowing was unaffordable or unsustainable.
- Given Miss M's credit limit was increased by small amounts in November 2017 and May 2019, I think it was reasonable and proportionate for LRUk to rely on the way she had been managing her account.
- Based on the information LRUk had regarding Miss M's management of her account, I don't think there was anything to suggest that increasing her credit limit was likely to cause her harm.
- I don't think LRUk acted unfairly in any other way.

This means I don't think LRUk did anything wrong when it provided the catalogue account to Miss M.

I've also considered whether the relationship might have been unfair under s.140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974. However, for the reasons I've already given, I don't think LRUk lent irresponsibly to Miss M or otherwise treated her unfairly. I haven't seen anything to suggest that s.140A or anything else would, given the facts of this complaint, lead to a different outcome here.

I know this isn't the outcome Miss M hoped for. But for the reasons above, I'm not asking LRUk to do anything to put things right.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I'm not upholding Miss M's complaint about LRUk (RETAIL) Limited trading as La Redoute.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss M to accept or reject my decision before 17 November 2025.

Sarrah Turay  
**Ombudsman**