

## **The complaint**

Mr O has complained that, with regard to a car he acquired using a hire-purchase agreement with Lendable Ltd, trading as Autolend ("Lendable"), following the settlement of the agreement there was a delay in Lendable issuing the clearance letter saying it had no further interest in the vehicle. Mr O was unhappy that he then incurred costs after having to rearrange collection of the car.

## **What happened**

Mr O acquired a used Mini in July 2024 using a hire purchase agreement with Lendable. Mr O decided to settle the agreement in February 2025, and he arranged the sale of the car to a motor dealer.

Mr O requested the settlement figure from Lendable on 12 February 2025, and paid the balance outstanding on the agreement - £15,083.25 - by bank transfer on 24 February 2025. This was applied by Lendable to Mr O's account the following day. Lendable also arranged the refund of Mr O's direct debit payment for February, as this was effectively an overpayment. Mr O said he received an email from Lendable on 25 February to say that it had received full repayment of the loan, but this didn't mention any further details.

As Mr O had arranged the sale of the car to a dealer, he needed confirmation from Lendable that it had no further interest in the vehicle. He said that he contacted Lendable by telephone and email to ask for clearance and on both occasions was told a letter (to be sent by email) had been requested.

Both Mr O and the buyer were keen to have the car collected, and the buyer had arranged for a third party to pick up the car on the following day – 26 February. As no email had been received, Mr O called Lendable on the morning of 26 February. He said he was assured that a letter had been requested, and the call handler said she could verbally confirm the agreement had been settled, but he needed written confirmation for the buyer. Lendable said the call handler told Mr O that she was waiting for confirmation from the finance department before issuing the letter.

The email had not arrived from Lendable by the time the buyer's transport company arrived later that day, and Mr O said that although he tried to call Lendable, the transport company was unable to wait. The buyer said he could reschedule collection at a cost to Mr O of £250.

Mr O said he then managed to contact Lendable, and after explaining the situation, and being put on hold for some time, the call handler sent the email confirmation whilst on the phone. Mr O explained the costs he had incurred, and the call handler registered a complaint. Mr O thought Lendable should refund the £250 he had paid to rearrange collection.

Lendable didn't uphold Mr O's complaint, saying that the clearance letter was provided as soon it was able to confirm clearance, which was within the standard timeframe of two days after receiving the payment. And it could find no evidence that Mr O was advised the letter would be issued sooner than this.

Mr O was unhappy with this, so he brought his complaint to this service. Our investigator looked into the complaint but didn't think it should be upheld. Mr O disagreed and asked for the complaint to be reviewed by an ombudsman.

### **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.

I've decided not to uphold Mr O's complaint. I'll explain why.

The key issue here is whether Lendable acted fairly in terms of the timescale in which it issued the clearance letter. I appreciate that Mr O is very unhappy about the situation – he has mentioned that in other cases he has received a clearance letter on the same day as repaying the finance agreement, although he didn't say that this had previously happened with Lendable.

I've carefully considered what both parties have said.

Lendable issued the clearance letter the day after it confirmed to Mr O that the loan had been repaid. I accept that clearance might have been confirmed by phone, but that the letter would've need to be issued by the finance department, and overall, I don't think this is an unreasonable timescale. I accept that it did not meet Mr O's requirements for collection of the car, but I think it's reasonable that there was some administration required to deal with the ending of the contract, and this wouldn't have been immediate. It's also not clear when Mr O made the arrangements for the car to be collected, and I've no evidence that Lendable promised the issue of the clearance letter within a particular timescale.

In summary, I appreciate that Mr O would've found the situation frustrating. However, I don't think Lendable has acted unfairly here in issuing the clearance letter the day after the finance was repaid. Therefore, I have decided that I cannot fairly uphold Mr O's complaint.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons given above, I have decided not to uphold Mr O's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr O to accept or reject my decision before 28 October 2025.

Jan Ferrari  
**Ombudsman**