

## **The complaint**

Miss M complains Gain Credit LLC trading as Lending Stream lent to her irresponsibly.

Miss M complains that the service she received from Lending Stream was poor.

## **What happened**

Miss M took nine loans with Lending Stream between October 2020 and 26 August 2024. These ranged from £170 and £850.

After Miss M had complained she received the final response letter from Lending Stream in June 2025. She referred it to the Financial Ombudsman Service, and one of our investigators considered that Loans 1, 3 and 6 were the ones about which Lending Stream needed to put things right for Miss M. Lending Stream had already conceded on Loan 6 – approved for her in January 2023.

Our investigator had looked at the treatment Miss M had received after the loan had been approved and overall did not think that Lending Stream had treated her unfairly. Miss M accepted the outcome on both parts – the irresponsible lending and the fair treatment.

Lending Stream did not accept the outcome for Loans 1 and 3. So the unresolved complaint was passed to me to decide. In light of the parties' responses then the disputed element only surrounds the lending of Loans 1 and 3. All other matters have been resolved. So, I have not reviewed those parts.

## **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 Miss M's case.

Lending Stream has already conceded in relation to Loan 6 and so the redress section includes that Loan 6 for completeness. As well as Loan 6, I've decided the credit wasn't provided fairly for Loans 1 and 3 because:

- I think the checks Lending Stream did before providing the credit were reasonable and proportionate given the credit limit it offered and what it knew about Miss M's financial situation. Miss M was not a high-income earner at £1,250 and £1,300 a month after tax.
- Based on the information Lending Stream gathered and what it knew about Miss M's circumstances, I think it should have realised Miss M was unable to sustainably repay what she was being lent. And I say this because I agree with our investigator's view and I've reviewed the evidence presented.
- Lending Stream's research and information showed that for Loan 1 Miss M had defaulted/delinquent accounts to the value of over £6,500 and had been issued with a default four months before she had applied to Lending Stream. This, plus the low disposable income after Lending Stream had carried out its checks and added up what she'd have had left after paying for everything, does persuade me that this loan

ought not to have been approved. Lending Stream's own research showed that she had experienced recent financial difficulties, having had a default imposed.

- For Loan 3, the disposable income Lending Stream calculated was even lower at around £50 a month. This, for a six-month instalment loan, was too low to be a reasonable sum left. And I have read the value of her delinquent/defaulted accounts was over £5,700 when Miss M applied to Lending Stream for Loan 3. So, considering it all together, I don't consider that it was likely that Miss M would be able to have repaid Loan 3 sustainably over a six-month period.

This means I don't think Lending Stream should have provided Loans 1 and 3 to Miss M. Loan 6 is being upheld by Lending Stream.

I've considered whether the relationship might have been unfair under s.140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974. However, I'm satisfied the redress I'm awarding in this case, as set out below, results in fair compensation for Miss M in the circumstances of this complaint. I'm therefore satisfied, based on what I've seen, that no additional award would be appropriate in this case.

### **Putting things right**

I've seen in correspondence that Lending Stream may have already actioned the redress in relation to Loan 6. In which case I'd expect the payments (including the offset) which has already taken place to be accounted for when carrying out the redress for Loans 1 and 3.

Loans 1 and 3 have been paid for by Miss M. So Lending Stream needs to refund the interest, fees and charges on Loans 1 and 3 (and Loan 6 unless already done so) together with an additional 8% annual simple interest \* calculated from the date she made the payments to the date of settlement.

The adverse credit in relation to Loans 1, 3 and 6 needs to be removed from Miss M's credit file if applicable.

\*HMRC usually requires Lending Stream to remove tax from this interest and so it must provide to Miss M a tax certificate if she asks for one.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I'm upholding this complaint in part and Lending Stream must put things right as I've set out above.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss M to accept or reject my decision before 19 February 2026.

Rachael Williams  
**Ombudsman**