

## **Complaint**

Miss W has complained about a loan Loans 2 Go Limited (“L2G”) provided to her. She says the payments were unaffordable.

## **Background**

One of our investigators reviewed what Miss W and L2G had told us. And she thought that L2G hadn’t done anything wrong or treated her unfairly. So she didn’t uphold Miss W’s complaint. Miss W disagreed and asked for an ombudsman to look at her complaint.

## **My findings**

I’ve considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what’s fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

We’ve explained how we handle complaints about unaffordable and irresponsible lending on our website. And I’ve used this approach to help me decide Miss W’s complaint.

Having carefully considered everything, I’ve decided not to uphold Miss W’s complaint. I’ll now explain why in a little more detail.

L2G needed to make sure that it didn’t lend irresponsibly. In practice, what this means is L2G needed to carry out proportionate checks to be able to understand whether Miss W could afford to repay before providing this loan. Our website sets out what we typically think about when deciding whether a lender’s checks were proportionate. Generally, we think it’s reasonable for a lender’s checks to be less thorough – in terms of how much information it gathers and what it does to verify it – in the early stages of a lending relationship.

But we might think it needed to do more if, for example, a borrower’s income was low or the amount lent was high. And the longer the lending relationship goes on, the greater the risk of it becoming unsustainable and the borrower experiencing financial difficulty. So we’d expect a lender to be able to show that it didn’t continue to lend to a customer irresponsibly.

L2G provided Miss W with a loan for £700 in November 2023. The loan was due to be repaid in 18 monthly instalments of £143.89.

L2G says it agreed to Miss W’s application after she provided details of her monthly income and expenditure. It says it cross-checked this against information on a credit search it carried out on Miss W. The information Miss W provided about her income and expenditure showed she’d be able to make the repayments she was committing to. But it, in any event, adjusted Miss W’s income and expenditure information to account for what its checks showed and this still showed the required payments were affordable. L2G says, in these circumstances it was reasonable to lend. On the other hand, Miss W has said she was in financial difficulty.

I've carefully thought about what Miss W and L2G have said. The first thing for me to say is that this was Miss W's first loan with L2G. The information provided suggests Miss W was asked to provide details of her income and expenditure. Equally, L2G did carry out external checks and didn't simply rely on what it was told.

L2G carried out a credit search which showed that Miss W didn't have any recent significant adverse information – such as defaulted accounts or county court judgments (“CCJ”) - recorded against her. Furthermore, while I appreciate that Miss W may not agree with this, I don't think that the amount she owed was excessive. This is especially as the loan she has referred to taking out a week before this one hadn't yet been reported and she was up to date with her existing active credit commitments too.

Bearing in mind the amount of the repayments appeared affordable and Miss W's lack of any previous lending with L2G, I don't think it was unreasonable for L2G to proceed on the basis of the information it obtained as, on the face of things, it appeared to be accurate.

I accept Miss W's actual circumstances may not have been reflected in the information she provided and the other information L2G obtained. But L2G could only make its decision based on the information it had available at the time. I've noted that Miss W has said that L2G should have reviewed her bank statements as part of her application and this would have shown she couldn't afford this loan.

However, at this stage of the lending relationship and bearing in mind the circumstances, I don't think proportionate checks would've extended into L2G asking Miss W to provide her bank statements. Indeed, L2G wasn't aware and can't reasonably be expected to have been aware of the loan that Miss W had recently taken and given the other information in the credit check, there was nothing to suggest that the information Miss W had provided and what L2G had obtained may not have been accurate.

Equally it's only fair and reasonable for me to uphold a complaint in circumstances a lender did something wrong. And, in this case, I don't think that L2G did anything wrong in deciding to lend to Miss W - it carried out proportionate checks even though it looks like the information it was provided with may not have told the whole story. L2G reasonably relied on this information and given its lack of history with Miss W, I don't think it was unreasonable for L2G to provide this loan.

In reaching my conclusions, I've also considered whether the lending relationship between L2G and Miss W might have been unfair to Miss W under section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 (“CCA”).

However, for the reasons I've explained, I don't think L2G irresponsibly lent to Miss W or otherwise treated her unfairly. And I haven't seen anything to suggest that section 140A CCA or anything else would, given the facts of this complaint, lead to a different outcome here.

As this is the case, I'm not upholding Miss W's complaint. I appreciate this will be very disappointing for Miss W. But I hope she'll understand the reasons for my decision and that she'll at least feel her concerns have been listened to.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I'm not upholding Miss W's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss W to accept

or reject my decision before 13 April 2026.

Jeshen Narayanan  
**Ombudsman**