

The complaint

Mr F complains that PROPEL HOLDINGS (UK) LIMITED trading as Quidmarket lent to him irresponsibly and when he had a gambling habit.

What happened

Here is a brief table of the lending.

Loan	Approved	Amount	Terms (rounded)	Repaid
1	27 November 2020	£350	£164 x 3 months	15 February 2021
2	25 March 2021	£400	£190 x 3 months	15 June 2021
3	19 October 2021	£500	£163 x 6 months	14 April 2022
4	26 May 2022	£400	£189 x 3 months	15 June 2022

There was a gap between each of the loans and a long gap between Loans 2 and 3. In June 2022 Mr F called Quidmarket to ask it to delete his account and not to lend to him again.

The complaint was referred to the Financial Ombudsman Service and our investigator gave comprehensive reasons why she did not consider Quidmarket needed to put things right for Mr F. He disagreed and the unresolved complaint was 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.

We've set out our general approach to complaints about unaffordable or irresponsible lending on our website and I've taken this into account in deciding Mr F's case. I've decided the credit was provided fairly because:

- I think the checks Quidmarket did before providing the credit were reasonable and proportionate given the credit limit it offered and what it knew about Mr F's financial situation.
- For each loan application Quidmarket did a credit search, knew that he'd defaulted on accounts in the past but had either paid them off or was doing so. It was aware that the main bulk of his indebtedness was a secured loan he held with another person. It used credit reference agency details to check Mr F's declared income and at Loan 4 obtained a pay slip from him. It conducted an I&E for each application and the research and its calculations showed Mr F could afford the loans.
- There's no evidence that Mr F told Quidmarket about his gambling until after he'd paid off loan 4. So, I couldn't attribute that knowledge to it when Mr F was applying. Quidmarket had no reason to review any of Mr F's bank account statements - I consider that would have been disproportionate.
- Based on the information Quidmarket gathered and what it knew about Mr F's

circumstances, there was nothing to suggest he was unable to sustainably repay what he was being lent.

I don't think Quidmarket acted unfairly in any other way. This means I don't think Quidmarket did anything wrong when it provided the loan to Mr F.

I've also considered whether the relationship might have been unfair under s.140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974. However, for the reasons I've already given, I don't think Quidmarket lent irresponsibly to Mr F or otherwise treated him unfairly. I haven't seen anything to suggest that s.140A or anything else would, given the facts of this complaint, lead to a different outcome here.

I know this isn't the outcome Mr F hoped for. But for the reasons above, I'm not asking Quidmarket to do anything to put things right.

My final decision

My final decision is that I'm not upholding the complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr F to accept or reject my decision before 14 January 2026.

Rachael Williams
Ombudsman