

The complaint

Ms P complains about service issues related to a finance agreement that she has with Mitsubishi HC Capital UK PLC trading as Novuna Personal Finance ('Novuna').

What happened

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties so I'll only summarise it here.

In 2020, Ms P took out an interest bearing fixed term loan to fund the cost of windows – the loan was sold to her by a third party I'll refer to as 'T'. Ms P complained to Novuna about the way the loan was sold to her. However, as Novuna hadn't sold the loan to Ms P, it referred her to T. Ms P's complaint against T was dealt with by our Service and a final decision by an Ombudsman was issued on this complaint. Ms P was still unhappy with Novuna including about the service it provided to her. Our investigator didn't recommend upholding the complaint. Ms P disagreed so the matter has been passed to me for a decision.

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.

Although a number of issues have been raised, this decision only addresses those issues I consider to be materially relevant to this complaint. This isn't meant as a discourtesy to either party – it simply reflects the informal nature of our Service. However, I've given careful consideration to all of the submissions made before arriving at my decision.

The first thing to note is that I can't consider the matters around the sale of the loan. Ms P has already had a final decision issued by another Ombudsman at this Service on this matter. So, I won't consider the issues around the sale of the loan here. I know Ms P has concerns about Novuna relying on a third party to sell its loans. But this is a regulated activity, and she's had an opportunity to complain about that activity to the relevant party (T) so I can't add anything further to this issue.

I note Ms P's dissatisfaction with what she was told over the phone by one of Novuna's agent's – which was, in essence – that the loan she was sold by T was no longer being offered by Novuna with the suggestion (in the agent's opinion) that there was something wrong with this particular product. I appreciate Ms P is unhappy about what she was told but I can also see this was a one off mistake which was quickly rectified by Novuna who forwarded her complaint to the correct business within a few days of the call. Further, from listening to the call with the relevant agent, the main complaint Ms P had was with the sale of the loan – which as I've said was sold to her by a different business. So, I'm not going to ask Novuna to do anything further in terms of this particular customer service issue as I think it has fairly and reasonably done enough to rectify this mistake.

Ms P says the agent she spoke to wasn't able to clarify the terms of the loan and complains more generally about Novuna not giving her clear information about the loan and the interest that applies. But – and as I said I'm not looking at the sale of the loan and what Ms P was

told by T at that time – I think Novuna has provided Ms P with clear, fair and not misleading information throughout the term of the loan via the agreement itself as well as annual statements. So, I consider Novuna has acted fairly and reasonably here.

For all these reasons, whilst I know this will be a disappointing outcome for Ms P, I'm not upholding the complaint.

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 Ms P to accept or reject my decision before 21 October 2025.

Yolande Mcleod
Ombudsman