

The complaint

Miss W complains that PROPEL HOLDINGS (UK) LIMITED trading as Quidmarket lent to her when she could not afford it.

What happened

Miss W took one loan of £600 on 15 November 2024. It was scheduled to be repaid over six monthly instalments at just under £180 each month. Miss W repaid it all on 31 January 2025.

The details of this complaint are well-known to both parties, so I won't repeat them again here. The facts aren't in dispute, so I'll focus on giving the reasons for my decision. I've read all of Miss W's submissions.

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 W'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 Miss W's financial situation. This was a modest loan and the first time she'd applied to Quidmarket.
- Quidmarket's checks arrived at a disposable income figure which had a good enough margin – over £1,000 a month – for it not to be alerted to any issues surrounding repayments for the loan.
- I reviewed the credit search Quidmarket conducted in November 2024. Miss W's debt in total was £137,800 but a sizable part of that figure was made up of secured lending: a mortgage and a car finance agreement. These are distinct types of credit agreements. Miss W's credit card limit was £750, and she was using none of it. Miss W had a mail order account with a £0 balance which had been like that since June 2024. Miss W had no issues with her current accounts – one of which had an £800 overdraft facility of which she was using none. Although there had been some issues repaying the car finance a few months earlier, this had been made up, and Miss W was up to date with that account.
- Based on the information Quidmarket gathered and what it knew about Miss W's circumstances, there was nothing to suggest Miss W would be unable to sustainably repay what she was being lent.
- I recognise that Miss W has told us about her gambling. But it would be disproportionate for Quidmarket to have discovered, at this stage of the lending relationship, that Miss W was spending her money on gambling. Quidmarket was under no obligation to ask for bank statements and there's no evidence that Miss W

informed it of her compulsive spending when she applied. And it's unlikely she would have done.

- I've considered what Miss W has said about her health issues. There's no evidence at all that Miss W informed Quidmarket of this and so it's not a matter about which it would have known, or I would have expected it to have known.
- 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 Miss W.

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 Miss W or otherwise treated her 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 Miss W 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 Miss W's complaint about Quidmarket.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss W to accept or reject my decision before 5 March 2026.

Rachael Williams
Ombudsman