

The complaint

Mr and Mrs L's complaint is, in essence, that Shawbrook Bank Limited (the 'Lender') acted unfairly and unreasonably by (1) being party to an unfair credit relationship with them 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

Mr and Mrs L purchased a trial membership from a timeshare provider ('the Supplier') on 7 January 2016.

Mr and Mrs L then purchased full membership of a timeshare (the 'Fractional Club') from a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') on 24 March 2016 (the 'Time of Sale'). They entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 690 fractional points at a cost of £15,371 (the 'Purchase Agreement'). However, after trading in their trial membership, they ended up paying £11,376 for their Fractional Club membership.

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

Mr and Mrs L paid for their Fractional Club membership by taking finance of £15,252 from the Lender in both of their names (the 'Credit Agreement'). This also consolidated an existing loan they had with another finance provider.

Mr and Mrs L – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender on 28 June 2017 (the 'Letter of Complaint') to complain about:

1. Misrepresentations by the Supplier at the Time of Sale giving them a claim against the Lender under Section 75 of the CCA, which the Lender failed to accept and pay.
2. The Lender being party to an unfair credit relationship under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA.

(1) Section 75 of the CCA: the Supplier's misrepresentations at the Time of Sale

Mr and Mrs L say that the Supplier made a number of pre-contractual misrepresentations at the Time of Sale – namely that the Supplier:

1. told them that they were required to purchase fractional points when that was not true.
2. told them they could cancel at any time when that was not true.
3. told them that the Supplier's holiday resorts were exclusive to its members when that was not true.

Mr and Mrs L say that they have a claim against the Supplier in respect of one or more of the

misrepresentations set out above, and therefore, under Section 75 of the CCA, they have a like claim against the Lender, who, with the Supplier, is jointly and severally liable to Mr and Mrs L.

(2) Section 140A of the CCA: the Lender's participation in an unfair credit relationship

The Letter of Complaint set out several reasons why Mr and Mrs L say that the credit relationship between them and the Lender was unfair to them under Section 140A of the CCA. In summary, they include the following:

1. The terms of the agreement were unfair in themselves because the Lender paid the Supplier commission which was not disclosed to Mr and Mrs L.
2. They were pressured into purchasing Fractional Club membership by the Supplier.
3. The decision to lend was irresponsible because the Lender didn't carry out the right creditworthiness assessment.

The Lender dealt with Mr and Mrs L's concerns as a complaint and issued its final response letter on 23 August 2017, rejecting it on every ground.

Mr and Mrs L then referred the complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service. It was assessed by an Investigator who, having considered the information on file, upheld the complaint on its merits.

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

I considered the matter and issued a provisional decision (the 'PD') dated 11 August 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.

In short, a claim against the Lender under Section 75 essentially mirrors the claim Mr and Mrs L could make against 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 does not dispute that the relevant conditions are met in this complaint. And as I'm satisfied that Section 75 applies, if I find that the Supplier is liable for having misrepresented something to Mr and Mrs L at the

Time of Sale, the Lender is also liable.

This part of the complaint was made for several reasons that I set out at the start of this decision. While I recognise that Mr and Mrs L concerns about the way in which their Fractional Club membership was sold, they have not persuaded me that there was an actionable misrepresentation by the Supplier at the Time of Sale for the other reasons they allege. And I say that because firstly, in relation to being told they were required to purchase fractional points, this isn't an allegation Mr and Mrs L have made in their witness statement. And, no description has been provided as to what exactly they were told in this regard, by whom and in what context.

Secondly, in relation to being told they could cancel at any time, I acknowledge Mr and Mrs L have said this. But, beyond making the bare allegation, they haven't provided anything more specific about what exactly they were told in this regard. And, I can see from Mr and Mrs L's signed Information Statement from the Time of Sale that it explained the Supplier did not offer any re-sale, rental or re-purchase of fractional rights, but owners are entitled to sell their membership on the open market if they wish to do so. Taking this, along with the lack of evidence provided to support the allegation, I don't think it's likely any false statement in this regard was made to Mr and Mrs L.

Thirdly, in relation to being told the product was completely exclusive to members, I acknowledge that Mr and Mrs L have said this. But again, they haven't explained in any detail what exactly they were told about this at the Time of Sale. And, I can't see that any such guarantees were made in the sales documentation provided at the time. What's more, as there's nothing else on file that persuades there were any false statements of existing fact made to Mr and Mrs L by the Supplier at the Time of Sale, I do not think there was an actionable misrepresentation by the Supplier for the reasons they allege. For these reasons, therefore, I do not think the Lender is liable to pay Mr and Mrs L any compensation for the alleged misrepresentations of the Supplier. And with that being the case, I do not think the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with the Section 75 claim in question.

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

I have already explained why I am not persuaded that the contract entered into by Mr and Mrs L was misrepresented by the Supplier in a way that makes for a successful claim under Section 75 of the CCA and outcome in this complaint. But Mr and Mrs L also say that the credit relationship between them and the Lender was unfair under Section 140A of the CCA, when looking at all the circumstances of the case, including parts of the Supplier's sales process at the Time of Sale that they have concerns about. It is those concerns that I explore here.

As Section 140A of the CCA is relevant law, I do have to consider it. So, in determining what is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of the case, I will consider whether the credit relationship between Mr and Mrs L and the Lender was unfair.

Under Section 140A of the CCA, a debtor-creditor relationship can be found to have been or be unfair to the debtor because of one or more of the following: the terms of the credit agreement itself; how the creditor exercised or enforced its rights under the agreement; and any other thing done (or not done) by, or on behalf of, the creditor (either before or after the making of the agreement or any related agreement) (s.140A(1) CCA). Such a finding may also be based on the terms of any related agreement (which here, includes the Purchase Agreement) and, when combined with Section 56 of the CCA, on anything done or not done by the supplier on the creditor's behalf before the making of the credit agreement or any related agreement.

Section 56 plays an important role in the CCA because it defines the terms “antecedent negotiations” and “negotiator”. As a result, it provides a foundation for a number of provisions that follow it. But it also creates a statutory agency in particular circumstances. And while Section 56(1) sets out three of them, the most relevant to this complaint are negotiations conducted by the supplier in relation to a transaction financed or proposed to be financed by a debtor-creditor-supplier agreement.

A debtor-creditor-supplier agreement is defined by Section 12(b) of the CCA as “a restricted-use credit agreement which falls within section 11(1)(b) and is made by the creditor under pre-existing arrangements, or in contemplation of future arrangements, between himself and the supplier [...]”. And Section 11(1)(b) of the CCA says that a restricted-use credit agreement is a regulated credit agreement used to “finance a transaction between the debtor and a person (the ‘supplier’) other than the creditor [...] and “restricted-use credit” shall be construed accordingly.”

The Lender doesn’t dispute that there was a pre-existing arrangement between it and the Supplier. So, the negotiations conducted by the Supplier during the sale of Mr and Mrs L’s membership of the Fractional Club were conducted in relation to a transaction financed or proposed to be financed by a debtor-creditor-supplier agreement as defined by Section 12(b). That made them antecedent negotiations under Section 56(1)(c) – which, in turn, meant that they were conducted by the Supplier as an agent for the Lender as per Section 56(2). And such antecedent negotiations were “any other thing done (or not done) by, or on behalf of, the creditor” under s.140(1)(c) CCA.

Antecedent negotiations under Section 56 cover both the acts and omissions of the Supplier, as Lord Sumption made clear in Plevin, at paragraph 31:

“[Section] 56 provides that [when] antecedent negotiations for a debtor-creditor-supplier agreement are conducted by a credit-broker or the supplier, the negotiations are “deemed to be conducted by the negotiator in the capacity of agent of the creditor as well as in his actual capacity”. The result is that the debtor’s statutory rights of withdrawal from prospective agreements, cancellation and rescission may arise on account of the conduct of the negotiator whether or not he was the creditor’s agent.’ [...] Sections 56 and 140A(3) provide for a deemed agency, even in a case where there is no actual one. [...] These provisions are there because without them the creditor’s responsibility would be engaged only by its own acts or omissions or those of its agents.”

And this was recognised by Mrs Justice Collins Rice in Shawbrook & BPF v FOS at paragraph 135:

“By virtue of the deemed agency provision of s.56, therefore, acts or omissions ‘by or on behalf of’ the bank within s.140A(1)(c) may include acts or omissions of the timeshare company in ‘antecedent negotiations’ with the consumer”.

In the case of Scotland & Reast, the Court of Appeal said, at paragraph 56, that the effect of Section 56(2) of the CCA meant that “negotiations are deemed to have been conducted by the negotiator as agent for the creditor, and that is so irrespective of what the position would have been at common law” before going on to say the following in paragraph 74:

“[...] there is nothing in the wording of s.56(2) to suggest any legislative intent to limit its application so as to exclude s.140A. Moreover, the words in s.140A(1)(c) “any other thing done (or not done) by, or on behalf of, the creditor” are entirely apposite to include antecedent negotiations falling within the scope of s.56(1)(c) and which are deemed by s.56(2) to have been conducted by the supplier as agent of the creditor. Indeed the purpose

of s.56(2) is to render the creditor responsible for such statements made by the negotiator and so it seems to me wholly consistent with the scheme of the Act that, where appropriate, they should be taken into account in assessing whether the relationship between the creditor and the debtor is unfair.”¹

So, the Supplier is deemed to be Lender’s statutory agent for the purpose of the pre-contractual negotiations.

However, an assessment of unfairness under Section 140A isn’t limited to what happened immediately before or at the time a credit agreement and related agreement were entered into. The High Court held in *Patel* (which was recently approved by the Supreme Court in the case of *Smith*), that determining whether or not the relationship complained of was unfair had to be made “having regard to the entirety of the relationship and all potentially relevant matters up to the time of making the determination” – which was the date of the trial in the case of an existing credit relationship or otherwise the date the credit relationship ended. The breadth of the unfair relationship test under Section 140A, therefore, is stark. But it isn’t a right afforded to a debtor simply because of a breach of a legal or equitable duty. As the Supreme Court said in *Plevin* (at paragraph 17):

“Section 140A [...] does not impose any obligation and is not concerned with the question whether the creditor or anyone else is in breach of a duty. It is concerned with [...] whether the creditor’s relationship with the debtor was unfair.”

Instead, it was said by the Supreme Court in *Plevin* that the protection afforded to debtors by Section 140A is the consequence of all of the relevant facts.

I have considered the entirety of the credit relationship between Mr and Mrs L and the Lender along with all of the circumstances of the complaint and I do not 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 Supplier’s sales and marketing practices at the Time of Sale – which includes training material that I think is likely to be relevant to the sale; and
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;
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 Mr and Mrs L and the Lender.

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

Mr and Mrs L complaint about the Lender being party to an unfair credit relationship was also made for several reasons, all of which I set out at the start of this decision.

The PR says that the right checks weren’t carried out before the Lender lent to Mr and Mrs L. 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 Mr and Mrs L was actually unaffordable before also concluding that they

¹ The Court of Appeal’s decision in *Scotland* was recently followed in *Smith*.

lost out as a result and then consider whether the credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to them for this reason. Again, from the information provided, I am not satisfied that the lending was unaffordable for the Mr and Mrs L. If there is any further information on this (or any other points raised in this provisional decision) that Mr and Mrs L wish to provide, I would invite them to do so in response to this provisional decision.

Mr and Mrs L that they were pressured by the Supplier into purchasing Fractional Club membership at the Time of Sale. I acknowledge that they 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 Mr and Mrs L made the decision to purchase Fractional Club membership because their ability to exercise that choice was significantly impaired by pressure from the Supplier.

I'm not persuaded, therefore, that Mr and Mrs L's credit relationship with the Lender was rendered unfair to them under Section 140A for any of the reasons above. But there is another reason, perhaps the main reason, why they say their credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to them. 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. This was also the reason the Investigator upheld the complaint.

Was Fractional Club membership marketed and sold at the Time of Sale as an investment in breach of regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations?

The Lender does not dispute, and I am satisfied, that Mr and Mrs L'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 membership of the Fractional Club 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 PR says that the Supplier did exactly that at the Time of Sale. So, that is what I have considered next.

The term "investment" is not defined in the Timeshare Regulations. In *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*, the parties agreed that, 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" at [56]. I will use the same definition.

Mr and Mrs L's share in the Allocated Property clearly, in my view, constituted an investment as it offered them the prospect of a financial return – whether or not, like all investments, that was more than what they first put into it. But 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 Mr and Mrs L 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 evidence in this complaint that the Supplier made efforts to avoid specifically describing membership of the Fractional Club as an 'investment' or quantifying to prospective purchasers, such as Mr and Mrs L, 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. There were, for instance, disclaimers in the contemporaneous paperwork that state that Fractional Club membership was not sold to Mr and Mrs L as an investment.

I've considered the testimony provided by Mr and Mrs L. They have said:

"During this sales presentation, we were told lots of amazing things that would make you buy it. The man who took the presentation was man [sic] called [sales representative name] and he lied to us the whole time.

He told us that we could earn money on the product. He told us that he had a timeshare and that he made between £5,000 and £6,000 a year by renting it out to other people. He said it would be a way for us to get a holiday and to make money, it seemed like a win win."

I note here that Mr and Mrs L haven't described the sales representative making any reference to the investment element of the product i.e. the potential for a profit from the net sale proceeds from the Allocated Property. Regarding 'renting out' membership, the Supplier has confirmed that it was possible for customers to rent their annual allocation of points to family and friends, but they didn't offer a formal rental scheme. And, they've also confirmed that Mr and Mrs L didn't ever make any attempt to rent their points out in this way. I also note that while the PR has used the word 'profit' in the Letter of Complaint, Mr and Mrs L haven't done so in their testimony.

With that said, I acknowledge that the Supplier's training material left open the possibility that the sales representative may have positioned Fractional Club membership as an investment. And I accept that it's possible that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to them as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3) given the difficulty the Supplier was likely to have had in presenting a share in the net sales proceeds of the Allocated Property as an important feature of Fractional Club membership without breaching the relevant prohibition.

Nonetheless, it is not necessary to make a formal finding on that particular issue because, even if the Supplier did breach Regulation 14(3) at the Time of Sale, I am not persuaded that makes a difference to the outcome in this complaint anyway.

Was the credit relationship between the Lender and Mr and Mrs L rendered unfair?

As the Supreme Court's judgment in Plevin makes clear, it does not automatically follow that regulatory breaches create unfairness for the purposes of Section 140A. Such breaches and their consequences (if there are any) must be considered in the round, rather than in a narrow or technical way.

I am also mindful of what HHJ Waksman QC (as he then was) and HHJ Worster had to say

in Carney and Kerrigan (respectively) on causation.

In Carney, HHJ Waksman QC said the following in paragraph 51:

“[...] In cases of wrong advice and misrepresentation, it would be odd if any relief could be considered if they did not have at least some material impact on the debtor when deciding whether or not to enter the agreement. [...] in a case like the one before me, if in fact the debtors would have entered into the agreement in any event, this must surely count against a finding of unfair relationship under s140A. [...]”

And in Kerrigan, HHJ Worster said this in paragraphs 213 and 214:

“[...] The terms of section 140A(1) CCA do not impose a requirement of “causation” in the sense that the debtor must show that a breach caused a loss for an award of substantial damages to be made. The focus is on the unfairness of the relationship, and the court's approach to the granting of relief is informed by that, rather than by a demonstration that a particular act caused a particular loss. Section 140A(1) provides only that the court may make an order if it determines that the relationship is unfair to the debtor. [...]”

[...] There is a link between (i) the failings of the creditor which lead to the unfairness in the relationship, (ii) the unfairness itself, and (iii) the relief. It is not to be analysed in the sort of linear terms which arise when considering causation proper. The court is to have regard to all the relevant circumstances when determining whether the relationship is unfair, and the same sort of approach applies when considering what relief is required to remedy that unfairness. [...]”

So, it seems to me that, if I am to conclude that a breach of Regulation 14(3) led to a credit relationship between Mr and Mrs L and the Lender that was unfair to them and warranted relief as a result, whether the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) which, having taken place during its antecedent negotiations with Mr and Mrs L, is covered by Section 56 of the CCA, falls within the notion of "any other thing done (or not done) by, or on behalf of, the creditor" for the purposes of 140(1)(c) of the CCA and deemed to be something done by the Lender) lead them to enter into the Purchase Agreement and the Credit Agreement is an important consideration.

As outlined above, the only by Mr and Mrs L of “making money” from Fractional Club Membership related to renting out their points to friends and family, rather than the investment element of the membership (the net sale proceeds from the sale of the Allocated Property). But, again, the Supplier has confirmed that they've never made any attempt to do so. And, if the possibility of making money from renting it out was a key reason they bought it, I'd have expected them to have actually attempted to rent it out which it doesn't appear from what the Supplier has said that they have done at any stage.

Mr and Mrs L also took the opportunity in their testimony to set out why they were unhappy with the membership and what led to making their complaint. And, here they identified how the membership worked as holiday product, and the ongoing costs of membership including that the annual management fees had started to increase.

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 Mr and Mrs L'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). On the contrary, I think the evidence suggests they would have pressed ahead with their purchase whether or not there had been a breach of Regulation 14(3). And for that reason, I do not think the credit relationship between Mr and Mrs L's and the Lender was unfair to them even

if the Supplier had breached Regulation 14(3).

Section 140A: Conclusion

In conclusion, therefore, given all of the facts and circumstances of this complaint, I don't think the credit relationship between the Lender and Mr and Mrs L was unfair to them for the purposes of Section 140A. And taking everything into account, I think it's fair and reasonable to reject this aspect of the complaint on that basis.

Mr and Mrs L's Commission Complaint

I note that one of Mr and Mrs L'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 Agreement. The Supreme Court's recent judgment in Johnson and Wrench -v- FirstRand Bank, and Hopcroft -v- Close Brothers [2025] UKSC 33 ('Johnson, Wrench and Hopcroft') clarified the law on commission payments – albeit in the context of car dealers acting as credit brokers. In my view, the Supreme Court's judgment sets out principles which appear capable of applying to credit brokers other than car dealer–credit brokers. At present, I do not know what, if any, commission was paid by the Lender in respect of Mr and Mrs L's loan. Once I find out more information about this, I will finalise my findings on this complaint."

In conclusion, given the facts and circumstances of this complaint, I did not think that the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with Mr and Mrs L's Section 75 claim, and I was not currently persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with them under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to them for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA. And having taken everything into account, I could see no other reason why it would be fair or reasonable to direct the Lender to compensate them.

The Lender responded to the PD and accepted it. The PR also responded – they did not accept what I had said in the PD but did not provide any further comments or evidence they wished to be considered.

Following my provisional decision, I also explained to both sides why I was not persuaded that Mr and Mrs L's credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to them for reasons relating to the commission arrangements between it and the Supplier. Neither party had anything further to add in response.

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.

As explained above, while I acknowledge that the PR said they (and Mr and Mrs L) disagreed with my provisional decision, they did not provide any explanation as to why or provide any further evidence or arguments they wished to be considered.

It follows that as neither party has provided any new evidence or arguments, I don't believe there is any reason for me to reach a different conclusion from that which I reached in my provisional decision (outlined above). I do wish to stress that I have considered all the evidence and arguments afresh before reaching that conclusion.

So again, given the facts and circumstances of this complaint, I do not think that the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with Mr and Mrs L's Section 75 claim, and I am not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with them under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to them for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA. And having taken everything into account, I see no other reason why it would be fair or reasonable to direct the Lender to compensate them.

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 L and Mr L to accept or reject my decision before 5 January 2026.

Fiona Mallinson
Ombudsman