

The complaint

Mr W is unhappy with how RRG Group Limited brokered a car finance agreement.

What happened

Around November 2023 Mr W entered into a hire purchase agreement with a company I'll refer to as 'T'. The agreement was brokered by RRG.

Mr W says he expected the agreement to be at 0% interest, as he explained he had previously taken finance through RRG on 0% deals, and it told him this new agreement was "*like for like*". But Mr W explained when he later received a statement, that he realised the agreement did have interest applied.

Mr W complained to RRG in November 2024. RRG said as the conversation Mr W had at the time was verbal, there were no records of this. But it explained the term 'like for like' was in relation to the monthly payment. And it said this was comparable between the agreements. RRG also said the finance agreement clearly set out the interest rate and that by signing it Mr W agreed to the terms.

Mr W remained unhappy. He said he'd previously been told a prior agreement was 'like for like' and this had been set up at the same interest rate as his existing finance at the time. So, he said he understood the term 'like for like' meant the rate of interest would be the same.

RRG responded and explained while previous finance Mr W took had the same rate, the agreements weren't like for like in all respects. RRG offered Mr W a 5% discount on a new car as a gesture of goodwill.

Although RRG replied to Mr W's complaint at the time, it didn't issue a final response. Mr W remained unhappy and referred the complaint to our service.

Our investigator issued a view and did not uphold the complaint. In summary, he said he thought the terms of the agreement Mr W signed made it clear the finance had interest applied.

Mr W was unhappy with this. In summary, he said RRG approached him with the offer it made. He said it was reasonable to believe the finance was on a 0% deal. He explained when he signed the agreement, he trusted the staff present and only checked the monthly payments. He said at no point was it drawn to his attention that the agreement contained interest.

As Mr W remained unhappy, the complaint has been passed to me 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.

Having done so, I don't think this complaint should be upheld. I'll explain why.

Mr W complains about what RRG told him when it acted as a credit broker. So, I'll consider if I think it misrepresented the finance to him or did something else wrong when it brokered the agreement.

I would consider a misrepresentation to have occurred if Mr W was told a 'false statement of fact' about the finance, that induced him into entering into the agreement when he otherwise would not have.

I've thought very carefully about what Mr W said here. And I've reviewed contact he had with RRG.

Mr W has been very consistent with his testimony to RRG and our service that he was told the finance was 'like for like'. I appreciate the lack of evidence available to *prove* that this was said to him. But I'm persuaded from what Mr W said that he was told at least something similar to this by RRG.

However, I need to think about what 'like for like' actually means. And as part of this, I also need to consider the *specifics* of what Mr W was told.

I've thought about the phrase "*like for like*". Having done so, I think under the circumstances of this complaint it is somewhat nonspecific. For instance, Mr W has explained this meant the interest rate would remain the same, whereas RRG said this meant the monthly payments would remain the same. Neither party seems to argue it meant the finance would be identical – nor would this have been possible given a new car was supplied at the time.

This is where the context of exactly what was said to Mr W is important. To give two examples, the statements "*yes the interest rate will be the same, it's like for like*" would be very different from "*the monthly payments are roughly the same, so it's like for like*". To be blunt, I have very little idea of *specifically* what Mr W was told. It follows it's very difficult to conclude he was given a 'false statement of fact'.

I will say that I'm satisfied it's likely Mr W was *not* specifically told that the new agreement was on 0% interest or a similar statement made.

I've then gone on to consider what else took place at the time. I'm satisfied as part of the credit broking Mr W was provided with the credit agreement from T. So, I've considered this.

I want to reassure Mr W that I've carefully thought about everything he said here. I appreciate he explained he trusted the staff present and only reviewed the monthly payments. But I still need to consider that the interest rate, and amount, were displayed at the top of the first page Mr W saw. This means even if I accepted Mr W was told something misleading, he was then presented with the correct information before he entered into the agreement.

Finally, even if I was satisfied Mr W was told a false statement of fact, I'm not confident that he wouldn't have entered into the contract anyway. I say this as he appears to have been happy to enter an agreement with roughly the same monthly payments as his previous one, and presumably at the point he took the finance he was also keen to acquire the new car supplied under it.

I want to reassure Mr W that I've carefully considered everything else he said here, including all the points about his previous finance and history with RRG. But, thinking about everything, I haven't seen enough to persuade me the finance agreement was

misrepresented to Mr W by RRG, nor that it did anything else in its role as a credit broker that it needs to take further action on at this point.

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 Mr W to accept or reject my decision before 3 December 2025.

John Bower
Ombudsman