

The complaint

Miss S complains that Lendable Ltd gave her incorrect information about how a payment plan would affect her credit file.

What happened

Miss S had a personal loan with Lendable and called them as she was experiencing financial difficulty and couldn't make the upcoming scheduled loan payment. Miss S only had a few payments remaining on her loan, and Lendable agreed to put Miss S on a payment plan such that she didn't have to make the upcoming payment and where that payment would be added on to the end of her loan, extending the loan term by one month.

Lendable's agent explained to Miss S that being on a payment plan may affect her credit file but that it would be less impactful than if she simply missed the payment. Miss S later questioned that point with Lendable, who apologised for any confusion Miss S may have experienced and who referred Miss S to a credit reference agency, who would be better placed to advise her on how her credit file may be affected. Miss S wasn't happy that Lendable had given her potentially incorrect information, so she raised a complaint.

Lendable responded to Miss S but confirmed that the information that their agent had provided about a payment plan being less impactful than a missed payment was correct. Miss S wasn't satisfied with Lendable's response, so she referred her complaint to this service.

One of our investigators looked at this complaint. But they didn't feel that Lendable had acted unfairly towards Miss S and so didn't uphold the complaint. Miss S remained dissatisfied, so the matter was escalated to an ombudsman for a final 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.

Miss S has provided a screenshot of an email she received Lendable which she feels shows that Lendable have confirmed that they provided her incorrect advice. However, I don't share Miss S's interpretation of Lendable's message, which to confirm reads as follows:

"I would like to offer an apology for any confusion caused during our call where I advised you that going on a payment plan would have less of an effect on your credit file than missing a payment.

For any advice on your credit file and how plans and missed payments are reported, you can speak to [the credit reference agencies] for further help and support"

Whereas Miss S interprets the above as an admission by Lendable that they gave her incorrect information, I read it differently. Specifically, I interpret that above as Lendable apologising for any confusion Miss S may have experienced having been given the

information, and not as an admission that the information itself was wrong.

I also read it as Lendable then referring Miss S to the credit reference agencies themselves, who it stands to reason would be best placed to explain how payment plans and missed payments impact credit files, which are maintained by the credit reference agencies.

It's also notable that in their response to Miss S's complaint, Lendable stated that their agent hadn't given Miss S any incorrect information, and that a payment plan should adversely impact a credit file to a lesser extent than a missed payment would adversely impact it.

My understanding aligns with Lendable's position: a payment plan is generally less impactful than a missed payment. I also agree that referring Miss S to the credit reference agencies was appropriate, as they maintain credit files and can provide definitive guidance. I've reviewed the call between Miss S and Lendable, during which the agent confirmed this point. On that call, Miss S explained she was between jobs, unable to make the upcoming payment, and contacting all her creditors to make arrangements

One reason I feel that this is important is because this service is outcome focussed. In this instance, by Miss S's own explanation on that call, she couldn't afford to make the upcoming payment and so her options were either to come to an arrangement or to miss the payment. Either way, Miss S's credit file would most likely be adversely affected. It's therefore unclear what outcome Miss S believes she was unfairly denied. And this is especially the case given that, as explained, it is my understanding that the information that Lendable's agent gave to Miss S was correct.

Miss S has asked whether the information given to her by Lendable was in line with regulatory expectations. However, this service isn't a regulatory body, and so it isn't within my remit or authority to state that Lendable have acted in accordance with regulation or not.

Instead, this service is an informal, impartial dispute resolution service. While we do take relevant law and regulation into account when arriving at our decisions, our remit is focussed on determining whether we feel a fair or unfair outcome has occurred – from an impartial perspective, after taking all the factors and circumstances of a complaint into consideration.

In this instance, I feel that Lendable have treated Miss S fairly here, for the reasons explained above, including that the information they gave to her doesn't appear to be incorrect and wouldn't have had any tangible impact on Miss S – given the seriousness of her financial position as she explained it to Lendable – even if it were incorrect.

Miss S has also asked whether the emotional impact and financial anxiety she experienced because of the information she was given warrants redress. I don't feel that it does, because, to reiterate, I don't feel that the information was incorrect. Instead, as alluded to at the beginning of this section, I feel that Miss S may have misinterpreted Lendable's later dialogue with her as an admission of mistake where no such admission was present.

In summary: I am not upholding this complaint because I do not find that Lendable provided Miss S with incorrect information. The advice that a payment plan would generally have less impact on a credit file than a missed payment aligns with my understanding and appears reasonable. Lendable's subsequent apology was for any confusion, not an admission of error, and referring Miss S to credit reference agencies was appropriate since they maintain credit files.

Additionally, given Miss S's financial position at the time, her options were limited to either a payment plan or missing a payment—both of which would likely affect her credit file. Therefore, even if the information had been wrong (which I do not believe it was), it would

not have changed the outcome. I also do not consider the emotional impact claimed to warrant redress in these circumstances.

All of which means that I won't be upholding this complaint against Lendable or instructing them to take any further or alternative action. I realise this won't be the outcome Miss S was wanting, but I hope she will understand, given what I've explained, why I've made the final decision that I have.

My final decision

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

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss S to accept or reject my decision before 2 January 2026.

Paul Cooper
Ombudsman