

The complaint

Mrs O's complaint is, in essence, that Mitsubishi HC Capital UK PLC trading as Novuna Consumer Finance (the 'Lender') acted unfairly and unreasonably by (1) being party to an unfair credit relationship with her under Section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 (as amended) (the 'CCA') and (2) deciding against paying a claim under Section 75 of the CCA.

What happened

Mrs O, and her husband Mr O, purchased membership of a timeshare (the 'Fractional Club') from a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') on 23 August 2018 (the 'Time of Sale'). They entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 1,040 fractional points at a cost of £14,430 (the 'Purchase Agreement').

Fractional Club membership was asset backed – which meant it gave Mrs and Mr O more than just holiday rights. It also included a share in the net sale proceeds of a property named on the Purchase Agreement (the 'Allocated Property') after their membership term ends.

Mrs and Mr O paid for their Fractional Club membership by taking finance of £14,430 from the Lender (the 'Credit Agreement') in Mrs O's name only (as such, she is the only eligible complainant here).

Mrs O – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender on 18 October 2021 (the 'Letter of Complaint') to raise a number of different concerns. As those concerns haven't changed since they were first raised, and as both sides are familiar with them, it isn't necessary to repeat them in detail here beyond the summary above.

The Lender dealt with Mrs O's concerns as a complaint and issued its final response letter on 17 December 2021, rejecting it on every ground.

The complaint was then referred to the Financial Ombudsman Service. It was assessed by an Investigator who, having considered the information on file, rejected the complaint on its merits.

Mrs O disagreed with the Investigator's assessment and asked for an Ombudsman's decision – which is why it was passed to me.

At this point, the PR raised an additional point of complaint. Namely, that the Lender paid the Supplier commission, but this was not disclosed to Mrs O.

I considered the matter and issued a provisional decision (the 'PD') dated 24 July 2025. In that decision, I said:

“Section 75 of the CCA: the Supplier's misrepresentations at the Time of Sale

The CCA introduced a regime of connected lender liability under section 75 that affords consumers (“debtors”) a right of recourse against lenders that provide the finance for the acquisition of goods or services from third-party merchants (“suppliers”) in the event that there is an actionable misrepresentation and/or breach of contract by the supplier.

Certain conditions must be met if the protection afforded to consumers is engaged, including, for instance, the cash price of the purchase and the nature of the arrangements between the parties involved in the transaction. The Lender doesn’t dispute that the relevant conditions are met. But for reasons I’ll come on to below, it isn’t necessary to make any formal findings on them here.

It was said in the Letter of Complaint that Fractional Club membership had been misrepresented by the Supplier at the Time of Sale because Mrs (and Mr) O were:

- 1. Told that they had purchased an investment that would “considerably appreciate in value”.*
- 2. Promised a considerable return on their investment because they were told that they would own a share in a property that would considerably increase in value.*
- 3. Told that they could sell their Fractional Club membership to the Supplier or easily to third parties at a profit.*
- 4. Made to believe that they would have access to “the holiday apartment” at any time all year round.*

However, neither points 1 nor 2 strike me as misrepresentations even if such representations had been made by the Supplier (which I make no formal finding on). Telling prospective members that they were investing their money because they were buying a fraction or share of one of the Supplier’s properties was not untrue. And even if the Supplier’s sales representatives went further and suggested that the share in question would increase in value, perhaps considerably so, that sounds like nothing more than a honestly held opinion as there isn’t any accompanying evidence to persuade me that the relevant sales representative(s) said something that, while an opinion, amounted to a statement of fact that they did not hold or could not have reasonably held.

As for points 3 and 4, while it’s possible that Fractional Club membership was misrepresented at the Time of Sale for one or both of those reasons, I don’t think it’s probable. They’re given little to none of the colour or context necessary to demonstrate that the Supplier made false statements of existing fact and/or opinion. And as there isn’t any other evidence on file to support the suggestion that Fractional Club membership was misrepresented for these reasons, I don’t think it was.

So, while I recognise that Mrs O - and the PR - have concerns about the way in which Fractional Club membership was sold by the Supplier, when looking at the claim under Section 75 of the CCA, I can only consider whether there was a factual and material misrepresentation by the Supplier. For the reasons I’ve set out above, I’m not persuaded that there was. And that means that I don’t think that the Lender acted unreasonably or unfairly when it dealt with this particular Section 75 claim.

Section 140A of the CCA: did the Lender participate in an unfair credit relationship?

I’ve already explained why I’m not persuaded that Fractional Club membership was actionably misrepresented by the Supplier at the Time of Sale. But there are other aspects of the sales process that, being the subject of dissatisfaction, I must explore with Section 140A in mind if I’m to consider this complaint in full – which is what I’ve done next.

Having considered the entirety of the credit relationship between Mrs O and the Lender along with all of the circumstances of the complaint, I don't think the credit relationship between them was likely to have been rendered unfair for the purposes of Section 140A. When coming to that conclusion, and in carrying out my analysis, I have looked at:

- 1. The standard of the Supplier's commercial conduct – which includes its sales and marketing practices at the Time of Sale along with any relevant training material;*
- 2. The provision of information by the Supplier at the Time of Sale, including the contractual documentation and disclaimers made by the Supplier;*
- 3. Evidence provided by both parties on what was likely to have been said and/or done at the Time of Sale; and*
- 4. The inherent probabilities of the sale given its circumstances.*

I have then considered the impact of these on the fairness of the credit relationship between Mrs O and the Lender.

The Supplier's sales & marketing practices at the Time of Sale

Mrs O's complaint about the Lender being party to an unfair credit relationship was made for several reasons.

The PR says, for instance, that the right checks weren't carried out before the Lender lent to Mrs O. I haven't seen anything to persuade me that was the case in this complaint given its circumstances. But even if I were to find that the Lender failed to do everything it should have when it agreed to lend (and I make no such finding), I would have to be satisfied that the money lent to Mrs O was actually unaffordable before also concluding that she lost out as a result and then consider whether the credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to her for this reason. But from the information provided, I am not satisfied that the lending was unaffordable for Mrs O.

Connected to this is the suggestion by the PR that the Credit Agreement was arranged by an unauthorised credit broker, the upshot of which is to suggest that the Lender wasn't permitted to enforce the Credit Agreement. However, it looks to me like Mrs O knew, amongst other things, how much she was borrowing and repaying each month, who she was borrowing from and that she was borrowing money to pay for Fractional Club membership. So, even if the Credit Agreement was arranged by a broker that didn't have the necessary permission to do so (which I make no formal finding on), I can't see why that led to Mrs O's financial loss – such that I can say that the credit relationship in question was unfair on her as a result. And with that being the case, I'm not persuaded that it would be fair or reasonable to tell the Lender to compensate her, even if the loan wasn't arranged properly.

The PR also says that there was one or more unfair contract terms in the Purchase Agreement. But as I can't see that any such terms were operated unfairly against Mrs (and Mr) O in practice, nor that any such terms led them to behave in a certain way to their detriment, I'm not persuaded that any of the terms governing Fractional Club membership are likely to have led to an unfairness that warrants a remedy.

I acknowledge that Mrs and Mr O may have felt weary after a sales process that went on for a long time. But they say little about what was said and/or done by the Supplier during their sales presentation that made them feel as if they had no choice but to purchase Fractional Club membership when they simply did not want to. They were also given a 14-day cooling off period and they have not provided a credible explanation for why they did not cancel their membership during that time. And with all of that being the case, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that Mrs and Mr O made the decision to purchase Fractional Club

membership because their ability to exercise that choice was significantly impaired by pressure from the Supplier.

Overall, therefore, I don't think that Mrs O's credit relationship with the Lender was rendered unfair to her under Section 140A for any of the reasons above. But there is another reason, perhaps the main reason, why the PR says the credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to her. And that's the suggestion that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to them as an investment in breach of prohibition against selling timeshares in that way.

The Supplier's alleged breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations

The Lender does not dispute, and I am satisfied, that Mrs and Mr O's Fractional Club membership met the definition of a "timeshare contract" and was a "regulated contract" for the purposes of the Timeshare Regulations.

Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations prohibited the Supplier from marketing or selling Fractional Club membership as an investment. This is what the provision said at the Time of Sale:

"A trader must not market or sell a proposed timeshare contract or long-term holiday product contract as an investment if the proposed contract would be a regulated contract."

But the PR says that the Supplier did exactly that at the Time of Sale – saying, in summary, that Mrs and Mr O were told by the Supplier that Fractional Club membership was the type of investment that would only increase in value.

The term "investment" is not defined in the Timeshare Regulations. But for the purposes of this provisional decision, and by reference to the decided authorities, an investment is a transaction in which money or other property is laid out in the expectation or hope of financial gain or profit.

A share in the Allocated Property clearly constituted an investment as it offered Mrs and Mr O the prospect of a financial return – whether or not, like all investments, that was more than what they first put into it. But it is important to note at this stage that the fact that Fractional Club membership included an investment element did not, itself, transgress the prohibition in Regulation 14(3). That provision prohibits the marketing and selling of a timeshare contract as an investment. It doesn't prohibit the mere existence of an investment element in a timeshare contract or prohibit the marketing and selling of such a timeshare contract per se.

In other words, the Timeshare Regulations did not ban products such as the Fractional Club. They just regulated how such products were marketed and sold.

To conclude, therefore, that Fractional Club membership was marketed or sold to Mrs and Mr O as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3), I have to be persuaded that it was more likely than not that the Supplier marketed and/or sold membership to them as an investment, i.e. told them or led them to believe that Fractional Club membership offered them the prospect of a financial gain (i.e., a profit) given the facts and circumstances of this complaint.

There is competing evidence in this complaint as to whether Fractional Club membership was marketed and/or sold by the Supplier at the Time of Sale as an investment in breach of regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations.

On the one hand, it is clear that the Supplier made efforts to avoid specifically describing membership of the Fractional Club as an 'investment' or quantifying to prospective purchasers, such as Mrs and Mr O, the financial value of their share in the net sales proceeds of the Allocated Property along with the investment considerations, risks and rewards attached to them.

I've also considered the witness testimony provided in this case by Mrs and Mr O.

The PR didn't provide any testimony or supporting evidence in relation to this allegation when the complaint was first referred to our Service. I acknowledge they alleged in the Letter of Complaint that the membership was sold to Mrs and Mr O as an investment at the Time of Sale. But, ultimately, a Letter of Complaint is not evidence.

In December 2023, in response to the Investigator's view, the PR provided some testimony from Mrs and Mr O which is not signed or dated. Insofar as it relates to this Time of Sale, Mrs and Mr O said:

"They told us that the property will be sold at the end of 19 years and the money will be shared with us."

*This only seems to represent a factual description of how Fractional Club membership worked, rather than any promise by the salesperson of a financial gain or profit. I'm also mindful that this testimony was only provided in late 2023, following the Investigator's view and the judgment in *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*¹. So, there is a risk that Mrs and Mr O's testimony here has been influenced by one or both of those. The testimony is also fairly brief in relation to this particular allegation, with little detail as to what exactly they were told, by whom and in what context, so it doesn't particularly assist me in my decision making process.*

For all of these reasons, I don't think that I can put much, if any, weight on the testimony that's been provided.

On the other hand, I acknowledge that the Supplier's sales process left open the possibility that the sales representative may have positioned Fractional Club membership as an investment. So, I accept that it's equally possible that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to Mrs and Mr O as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3).

However, whether or not there was a breach of the relevant prohibition by the Supplier is not ultimately determinative of the outcome in this complaint for reasons I will come on to shortly. And with that being the case, it's not necessary to make a formal finding on that particular issue for the purposes of this decision.

Was the credit relationship between the Lender and the Consumer rendered unfair?

Having found that it was possible that the Supplier breached Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations at the Time of Sale, I now need to consider what impact that breach had on the fairness of the credit relationship between Mrs O and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement as the case law on Section 140A makes it clear that regulatory breaches do not automatically create unfairness for the purposes of that provision. Such breaches and their consequences (if there are any) must be considered in the round, rather than in a narrow or technical way.

¹ *R (on the application of Shawbrook Bank Ltd) v Financial Ombudsman Service Ltd and R (on the application of Clydesdale Financial Services Ltd (t/a Barclays Partner Finance)) v Financial Ombudsman Service* [2023] EWHC 1069 (Admin) ('*Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*').

Indeed, it seems to me that, if I am to conclude that a breach of Regulation 14(3) led to a credit relationship between Mrs O and the Lender that was unfair to her and warranted relief as a result, whether the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) led her to enter into the Purchase Agreement and the Credit Agreement is an important consideration.

I've again considered Mrs and Mr O's testimony here. For the reasons already given above, I'm unable to place much, if any, weight on the testimony that's been provided here.

In addition, what Mrs and Mr O have had to say only represents what they were potentially told at the Time of Sale, it doesn't particularly give any insight into what their motivations were for making the purchase apart from that they wanted to finish the process and leave the sales environment. They've said, for example, "We just wanted to get it finished so we could go."

So, on my reading of the evidence before me, the prospect of a financial gain from Fractional Club membership was not an important and motivating factor when they decided to go ahead with their purchase. That doesn't mean they weren't interested in a share in the Allocated Property. After all, that wouldn't be surprising given the nature of the product at the centre of this complaint. But as Mrs and Mr O themselves don't persuade me that their purchase was motivated by their share in the Allocated Property and the possibility of a profit, I don't think a breach of Regulation 14(3) by the Supplier was likely to have been material to the decision they ultimately made.

On balance, therefore, even if the Supplier had marketed or sold the Fractional Club membership as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations, I am not persuaded that Mrs (and Mr) O's decision to purchase Fractional Club membership at the Time of Sale was motivated by the prospect of a financial gain (i.e., a profit). And for that reason, I do not think the credit relationship between Mrs O and the Lender was unfair to her even if the Supplier had breached Regulation 14(3).

Mrs O's Commission Complaint

*I note that one of Mrs O's other concerns relates to alleged payments of commission by the Lender to the Supplier for acting as a credit broker and arranging the Credit Agreements. The Court of Appeal's recent judgment in *Johnson and Wrench -v- FirstRand Bank, and Hopcroft -v- Close Brothers* [2024] EWCA Civ 1282 ('*Johnson, Wrench and Hopcroft*') sought to clarify the law on secret and partially disclosed commission – albeit in the context of car dealers acting as credit brokers. In my view, the Court of Appeal's judgment sets out principles which appear capable of applying to credit brokers other than car dealer–credit brokers. But as it was recently appealed to the Supreme Court, whose judgment is still pending, I don't intend on finalising my thoughts on this complaint until it is handed down and its implications on this complaint, if there are any, considered."*

So, in conclusion, as things stood at that time, I did not think that the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with the relevant Section 75 claim, and putting the issue of commission to one side for the time being, I was not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with Mrs O under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to her for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA – nor could I see no other reason why it would be fair or reasonable to direct the Lender to compensate her.

Following my provisional decision, I also communicated how I was not persuaded that Mrs O's credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to her for reasons relating to the

commission arrangements between it and the Supplier. Neither party responded to this, nor provided any further comments on this point.

The Lender did not respond to the PD. The PR did respond – they did not accept the PD and provided some further comments and evidence they wish to be considered.

Having received the relevant responses from both parties, I'm now finalising my decision.

The legal and regulatory context

In considering what is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of the complaint, I am required under DISP 3.6.4R to take into account: relevant (i) law and regulations; (ii) regulators' rules, guidance and standards; and (iii) codes of practice; and (where appropriate), what I consider to have been good industry practice at the relevant time.

The legal and regulatory context that I think is relevant to this complaint is, in many ways, no different to that shared in several hundred published ombudsman decisions on very similar complaints – which can be found on the Financial Ombudsman Service's website. And with that being the case, it is not necessary to set out that context in detail here. But I would add that the following regulatory rules/guidance are also relevant:

The Consumer Credit Sourcebook ('CONC') – Found in the Financial Conduct Authority's (the 'FCA') Handbook of Rules and Guidance

Below are the most relevant provisions and/or guidance as they were at the relevant time:

- CONC 3.7.3 [R]
- CONC 4.5.3 [R]
- CONC 4.5.2 [G]

The FCA's Principles

The rules on consumer credit sit alongside the wider obligations of firms, such as the Principles for Businesses ('PRIN'). Set out below are those that are most relevant to this complaint:

- Principle 6
- Principle 7
- Principle 8

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.

Following the responses from both parties, I've considered the case afresh and having done so, I've reached the same decision as that which I outlined in my provisional findings, for broadly the same reasons.

Again, my role as an Ombudsman isn't to address every single point which has been made to date, but to decide what is fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint. If I haven't commented on, or referred to, something that either party has said, this doesn't mean I haven't considered it.

Rather, I've focused here on addressing what I consider to be the key issues in deciding this complaint and explaining the reasons for reaching my final decision.

The PR's further comments in response to the PD only relate to the issue of whether the credit relationship between Mrs O and the Lender was unfair. In particular, the PR has provided further comments in relation to whether the membership was sold to Mrs O as an investment at the Time of Sale. They also reiterated that in their view, the payment of a commission by the Lender to the Supplier led to an unfair credit relationship.

As outlined in my PD, the PR originally raised various other points of complaint, all of which I addressed at that time. But they didn't make any further comments in relation to those in their response to my PD. Indeed, they haven't said they disagree with any of my provisional conclusions in relation to those other points. And since I haven't been provided with anything more in relation to those other points by either party, I see no reason to change my conclusions in relation to them as set out in my PD. So, I'll focus here on the PR's points raised in response.

As I also outlined above, following my provisional decision, I also communicated to both parties how I was not persuaded that Mrs O's credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to her for reasons relating to the commission arrangements between it and the Supplier. Neither party responded to this, nor provided any further comments on this point. So, it follows that my conclusions on that point remain the same as previously communicated to both parties and since it hasn't been disputed further, I won't therefore be commenting on it any further in this decision.

Section 140A of the CCA: did the Lender participate in an unfair credit relationship?

The Supplier's alleged breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare regulations

The PR explained in their response to my PD that they hadn't shared the Investigator's view on this complaint with Mrs O, saying "*this was done in order not to influence their recollections*".

The PR said this means Mrs O's recollections have not been influenced by either the Investigator's view or the aforementioned judgment.

Part of my assessment of the testimony was to consider *when* it was written, and whether it may have been affected by external factors such as the widespread publication of the outcome of *Shawbrook and BPF v FOS*.

I have thought about what the PR has said, but on balance, I don't find it a credible explanation of the contents of Mrs O's evidence. Here, the PR responded to our Investigator's view to say that Mrs O alleged that Fractional Club membership had been sold to them as an investment and it provided evidence from Mrs O to that effect. I fail to understand how Mrs O disagreed with the view and PD on the basis that the timeshare was sold as an investment if she didn't know our Investigator's conclusions. It follows, I think it more likely than not, that Mrs O did know about our Investigator's view before they evidence was provided.

So, I maintain that there is a risk that Mrs O's testimony was coloured by the Investigator's view and/or the outcome in *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*. And, on balance, the way in which the evidence has been provided makes me conclude that I can place little weight on it. So, ultimately, for the above reasons, along with those I already explained in my PD, I remain unpersuaded that any breach of Regulation 14(3) was material to Mrs O's purchasing decision.

The PR also said that in the judgment handed down in *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*, it was not challenged that the product in question was marketed and sold as an investment. But, as I explained in my provisional decision, the Timeshare Regulations did not ban products such

as the Fractional Club. They just regulated how such products were marketed and sold. And the judgment referred to did not make a blanket finding that all such products were mis-sold in the way the PR appears to be suggesting. Any complaint needs to be considered in the light of its specific circumstances.

So, as I said before, even if the Supplier had marketed or sold the membership as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3) (which I still make no finding on here), I'm not persuaded Mrs O's decision to make the purchase was motivated by the prospect of a financial gain. So, I still don't think the credit relationship between Mrs O and the Lender was unfair to her for this reason.

S140A conclusion

Given all of the factors I've looked at in this part of my decision, and having taken all of them into account, I'm not persuaded that the credit relationship between Mrs O and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement was unfair to her. So, I don't think it is fair or reasonable that I uphold this complaint on that basis.

My final decision

For the reasons set out above, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs O to accept or reject my decision before 8 January 2026.

Fiona Mallinson
Ombudsman