

The complaint

Mr and Mrs B'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 B were members of a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') – having purchased a number of products from it over time. But the product at the centre of this complaint is their membership of a timeshare that I'll call the 'Fractional Club' – which they bought on 27 December 2013 (the 'Time of Sale'). They entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 5,500 fractional points at a cost of £6,240 (the 'Purchase Agreement').

Fractional Club membership was asset backed – which meant it gave Mr and Mrs B 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.

Mr and Mrs B paid for their Fractional Club membership by paying a deposit of £800 and taking finance for the remaining amount of £5,440 from the Lender (the 'Credit Agreement').

Mr and Mrs B – using a professional representative (the 'PR1') – wrote to the Lender on 7 November 2016 (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 Mr and Mrs B's concerns as a complaint and issued its final response letter on 25 November 2016, rejecting it on every ground.

The complaint was then referred to the Financial Ombudsman Service.

While our Service was reviewing the matter, Mr and Mrs B engaged another professional representative (the 'PR2') who made a similar complaint about the same purchase to the Lender. The PR2 then took over from the PR1 in representing Mr and Mrs B on this complaint.

The complaint was assessed by an Investigator who, having considered the information on file, rejected the complaint on its merits.

Mr and Mrs B 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'). 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 Mr and Mrs B were told or led to believe by the Supplier that Fractional Club membership:

- (1) had a guaranteed end date when that was not true.*
- (2) was the only way of releasing themselves from their existing membership when that was not true.*
- (3) was exclusive to them (and other members) when that was not true.*

As I understand it, the sale of the Allocated Property could be postponed in certain circumstances according to the Fractional Club Rules. But Mr and Mrs B say little to nothing to persuade me that they were given a guarantee by the Supplier that the Allocated Property would be sold on a specific date when such a promise would have been impossible to stand by given the inevitable uncertainty of selling property some way into the future. And as there isn’t enough evidence on file to support the PR1’s allegation that Fractional Club membership had been misrepresented for reasons relating to points 2 and 3, I’m not persuaded that there were representations by the Supplier on the issues in question that constituted false statements of existing fact.

So, while I recognise that Mr and Mrs B 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.

The PR1 said, for instance, that:

- 1. the right checks weren’t carried out before the Lender lent to Mr and Mrs B;*
- 2. Mr and Mrs B were pressured by the Supplier into purchasing Fractional Club membership at the Time of Sale; and*
- 3. Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold as investment in breach of a prohibition on doing so.*

However, having considered the entirety of the credit relationship between Mr and Mrs B 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;
4. The inherent probabilities of the sale given its circumstances; and, when relevant
5. Any existing unfairness from a related credit agreement.

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

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

While the PR1 said that the right affordability checks weren't carried out at the Time of Sale, 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 B was actually unaffordable before also concluding that they lost out as a result and then consider whether the credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to them for this reason. But from the information provided, I am not satisfied that the lending was unaffordable for the Mr and Mrs B.

I acknowledge that Mr and Mrs B 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 B 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 Mr and Mrs B'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 the PR1 (and PR2) say the 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.

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

The Lender does not dispute, and I am satisfied, that Mr and Mrs B'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 PR1 and PR2 say that the Supplier did exactly that at the Time of Sale.

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 Mr and Mrs B 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 Mr and Mrs B 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 Mr and Mrs B, 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.

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 Mr and Mrs B 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 Mr and Mrs B 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.

Indeed, 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 B and the Lender that was unfair to them and warranted relief as a result, whether the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) led them to enter into the Purchase Agreement and the Credit Agreement is an important consideration.

I've considered the testimony provided in this case. The PR1 didn't provide any testimony from Mr and Mrs B when the complaint was first referred to our Service.

The PR2 subsequently provided a witness statement from Mr and Mrs B in October 2023. This is not signed but is dated February 2021 and the PR2 has provided evidence that it was drafted at that time. Insofar as it relates to this Time of Sale, Mr and Mrs B have said;

"We were told that this was the final purchase we needed to make in order to convert all of our remaining points to Fractionals, and hence exit this timeshare within 15 years. We were once again assured that we would get our money back after this 15 years [sic] period, and were offered a holiday in a cottage as an incentive for making this purchase. Therefore, after a pressured meeting in which the representative became angrier by the minute, repeatedly saying 'how could you turn this offer down?' and applying huge amounts of pressure on us, we agreed to this purchase."

But this only represents what Mr and Mrs B were potentially told at the Time of Sale, rather than what motivated them to purchase (beyond agreeing due to alleged pressure and the offer of an additional holiday as an incentive).

Mr and Mrs B go on to explain in some detail why they're unhappy with the membership now and they've said this is because the annual management fees have increased which, due to changes in their personal circumstances since the Time of Sale, are no longer affordable for them. They've also described issues with availability and the exclusivity of the membership i.e. how it functions as a holiday product. They've also said that the resorts which are available are inconvenient due to Mrs B's health conditions.

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 Mr and Mrs B 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 Mr and Mrs B 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 Mr and Mrs B'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 B and the Lender was unfair to them even if the Supplier had breached Regulation 14(3).

The provision of information by the Supplier at the Time of Sale

The PR2 says that Mr and Mrs B were not given sufficient information at the Time of Sale by the Supplier about the ongoing costs of Fractional Club membership. The PR2 also says that, because some of the terms of the Purchase Agreement weren't individually negotiated, they were unfair contract terms as were the terms governing the ongoing costs of membership.

As I've already indicated, the case law on Section 140A makes it clear that it does not automatically follow that regulatory breaches create unfairness for the purposes of the unfair relationship provisions. The extent to which such mistakes render a credit relationship unfair must also be determined according to their impact on the complainant.

I acknowledge that it is also possible that the Supplier did not give Mr and Mrs B sufficient information, in good time, on the various charges they could have been subject to as Fractional Club members in order to satisfy the requirements of Regulation 12 of the 2010 Timeshare Regulations (which was concerned with the provision of 'key information'). But even if that was the case, I cannot see that the ongoing costs of membership were applied unfairly in practice. And as neither Mr and Mrs B nor the PR2 have persuaded me that they would not have pressed ahead with their purchase had the finer details of the Fractional Club's ongoing costs been disclosed by the Supplier in compliance with Regulation 12, I cannot see why any failings in that regard are likely to be material to the outcome of this complaint given its fact and circumstances.

As for the PR2's argument that there were one or more unfair contract terms in the Purchase Agreement, I can't see that any such terms were operated unfairly against Mr and Mrs B in practice, nor that any such terms led them to behave in a certain way to their detriment. And with that being the case, 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 even if they could be said to be unfair contract terms, which I make no formal finding on.

Mr and Mrs B's Commission Complaint

*I note that one of Mr and Mrs B'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 B's loan. Once I find out more information about this, I will finalise my findings on this complaint."*

In conclusion, I did not think that the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with the relevant Section 75 claim, and if I put 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 Mr and Mrs B under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to them for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA – nor could I see any other reason why it would be fair or reasonable to direct the Lender to compensate them.

Following my provisional decision, I also communicated how I was not persuaded that Mr and Mrs B's credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to them for reasons relating to the commission arrangements between it and the Supplier¹.

The Lender responded to the PD and accepted it. The PR also responded – they said Mr and Mrs B did not accept the PD but beyond this, they didn't provide any further comments or evidence they wished 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 Office of Fair Trading's Irresponsible Lending Guidance – 31 March 2010

The primary purpose of this guidance was to provide greater clarity for businesses and consumer representatives as to the business practices that the Office of Fair Trading (the 'OFT') thought might have constituted irresponsible lending for the purposes of Section 25(2B) of the CCA. Below are the most relevant paragraphs as they were at the relevant time:

- Paragraph 2.2
- Paragraph 2.3
- Paragraph 5.5

The OFT's Guidance for Credit Brokers and Intermediaries - 24 November 2011

The primary purpose of this guidance was to provide clarity for credit brokers and credit intermediaries as to the standards expected of them by the OFT when they dealt with actual or prospective borrowers. Below are the most relevant paragraphs as they were at the relevant time:

- Paragraph 2.2
- Paragraph 3.7
- Paragraph 4.8

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 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

¹ The Lender did not respond. The PR did respond but confirmed they had nothing further to add.

decision (outlined above). I do wish to stress that I have considered all the evidence and arguments afresh before reaching that conclusion.

Conclusion

So again, in conclusion, 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 B'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 Mr B and Mrs B to accept or reject my decision before 24 February 2026.

Fiona Mallinson
Ombudsman