

### **The complaint**

Mr H's complaint is, in essence, that Shawbrook Bank Limited (the 'Lender') acted unfairly and unreasonably by (1) being party to an unfair credit relationship with him under Section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 (as amended) (the 'CCA') and (2) deciding against paying a claim under Section 75 of the CCA.

### **What happened**

Mr H was the member of a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier'), having previously purchased membership of a timeshare (the 'Fractional Club') from it. Then, on 15 February 2016 (the 'Time of Sale'), he made a further purchase with the Supplier of Fractional Club membership, thereby 'upgrading' his existing membership. He entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 1,380 fractional points at a cost of £7,706 (the 'Purchase Agreement'), after trading in his existing membership.

Fractional Club membership was asset backed – which meant it gave Mr H more than just holiday rights. It also included a share in the net sale proceeds of a property named on the Purchase Agreement (the 'Allocated Property') after his membership term ends.

Mr H paid for his Fractional Club membership by taking finance of £20,430 from the Lender (the 'Credit Agreement') in his sole name. This loan consolidated the outstanding balance of his previous loan (used to pay for his previous purchase) and was paid off in June 2019.

Mr H – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender on 16 June 2023 (the 'Letter of Complaint') to raise a number of different concerns. As those concerns haven't changed since they were first raised, and as both sides are familiar with them, it isn't necessary to repeat them in detail here beyond the summary above.

The Lender dealt with Mr H's concerns as a complaint and issued its final response letter on 13 May 2024, rejecting it on every ground.

The complaint was then referred to the Financial Ombudsman Service. It was assessed by an Investigator who, having considered the information on file, rejected the complaint on its merits.

Mr H disagreed with the Investigator's assessment and asked for an Ombudsman's decision – which is why it was passed to me.

I considered the matter and issued a provisional decision (the 'PD') dated 22 October 2025. In that decision, I said:

---

#### **"Section 75 of the CCA: the Supplier's misrepresentations at the Time of Sale**

---

*The CCA introduced a regime of connected lender liability under section 75 that affords consumers ("debtors") a right of recourse against lenders that provide the finance for the acquisition of goods or services from third-party merchants ("suppliers") in the event that there is an actionable misrepresentation and/or breach of contract by the supplier.*

*In short, a claim against the Lender under Section 75 essentially mirrors the claim Mr H could make against the Supplier.*

*Certain conditions must be met if the protection afforded to consumers is engaged, including, for instance, the cash price of the purchase and the nature of the arrangements between the parties involved in the transaction.*

*Further, creditors can reasonably reject Section 75 claims that they're first informed about after the claim has become time-barred under the Limitation Act 1980 (the 'LA'). The reason being, that it wouldn't be fair to expect creditors to look into such claims so long after the liability arose and after a limitation defence would be available in court.*

*Having considered everything, I think Mr H's claim for misrepresentation is likely to have been made too late under the relevant provisions of the LA, which means it would have been fair for the Lender to have turned down his Section 75 claim for this reason.*

*A claim under Section 75 is a 'like' claim against the creditor. A claim for misrepresentation against the Supplier would ordinarily be made under Section 2(1) of the Misrepresentation Act 1967. And the limitation period to make such a claim expires six years from the date on which the cause of action accrued, as per Section 2 of the LA.*

*But a claim like this one under Section 75 is also "an action to recover any sum by virtue of any enactment" under Section 9 of the LA. The limitation period under that provision is also six years from the date on which the cause of action accrued.*

*The date on which the cause of action accrued for the claim was the Time of Sale, which was 15 February 2016. I say this because Mr H entered into the membership at that time based on the alleged misrepresentations by the Supplier, which Mr H says he relied on. And, as the loan from the Lender was used to finance this membership, it was when Mr H entered into the Credit Agreement, on 15 February 2016, that he suffered a loss.*

*Mr H first notified the Lender of his Section 75 claim on 16 June 2023. Since this was more than six years after the Time of Sale, I don't think it was unfair or unreasonable of the Lender to reject Mr H's concerns about the Supplier's alleged misrepresentations at the Time of Sale.*

#### **Section 140A of the CCA: did the Lender participate in an unfair credit relationship?**

*I've already explained why I'm not persuaded that Fractional Club membership was actionably misrepresented by the Supplier at the Time of Sale. But there are other aspects of the sales process that, being the subject of dissatisfaction, I must explore with Section 140A in mind if I'm to consider this complaint in full – which is what I've done next.*

*Having considered the entirety of the credit relationship between Mr H and the Lender along with all of the circumstances of the complaint, I don't think the credit relationship between them was likely to have been rendered unfair for the purposes of Section 140A. When coming to that conclusion, and in carrying out my analysis, I have looked at:*

1. *The standard of the Supplier's commercial conduct – which includes its sales and marketing practices at the Time of Sale along with any relevant training material;*
2. *The provision of information by the Supplier at the Time of Sale, including the contractual documentation and disclaimers made by the Supplier;*
3. *Evidence provided by both parties on what was likely to have been said and/or done at the Time of Sale;*
4. *The inherent probabilities of the sale given its circumstances; and, when relevant*
5. *Any existing unfairness from a related credit agreement.*

*I have then considered the impact of these on the fairness of the credit relationship between Mr H and the Lender.*

#### **The Supplier's sales & marketing practices at the Time of Sale**

*Mr H's complaint about the Lender being party to an unfair credit relationship was made for several reasons.*

*The PR says, for instance, that the right checks weren't carried out before the Lender lent to Mr H. I haven't seen anything to persuade me that was the case in this complaint given its circumstances. But even if I were to find that the Lender failed to do everything it should have when it agreed to lend (and I make no such finding), I would have to be satisfied that the money lent to Mr H was actually unaffordable before also concluding that he lost out as a result and then consider whether the credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to him for this reason. But from the information provided, I am not satisfied that the lending was unaffordable for Mr H.*

*Connected to this is the suggestion by the PR that the Credit Agreement was arranged by an unauthorised credit broker, the upshot of which is to suggest that the Lender wasn't permitted to enforce the Credit Agreement. However, it looks to me like Mr H knew, amongst other things, how much he was borrowing and repaying each month, who he was borrowing from and that he was borrowing money to pay for Fractional Club membership. And as the lending doesn't look like it was unaffordable for him, even if the Credit Agreement was arranged by a broker that didn't have the necessary permission to do so (which I make no formal finding on), I can't see why that led to Mr H's financial loss – such that I can say that the credit relationship in question was unfair on him as a result. And with that being the case, I'm not persuaded that it would be fair or reasonable to tell the Lender to compensate him, even if the loan wasn't arranged properly.*

*The PR also says that there was one or more unfair contract terms in the Purchase Agreement. But as I can't see that any such terms were operated unfairly against Mr H in practice, nor that any such terms led him to behave in a certain way to his detriment, I'm not persuaded that any of the terms governing Fractional Club membership are likely to have led to an unfairness that warrants a remedy.*

*Overall, therefore, I don't think that Mr H's credit relationship with the Lender was rendered unfair to him under Section 140A for any of the reasons above. But there is another reason, perhaps the main reason, why the PR says the credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to him. And that's the suggestion that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to him as an investment in breach of prohibition against selling timeshares in that way.*

#### **The Supplier's alleged breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations**

*The Lender does not dispute, and I am satisfied, that Mr H's Fractional Club membership met the definition of a "timeshare contract" and was a "regulated contract" for the purposes of the Timeshare Regulations.*

*Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations prohibited the Supplier from marketing or selling Fractional Club membership as an investment. This is what the provision said at the Time of Sale:*

*"A trader must not market or sell a proposed timeshare contract or long-term holiday product contract as an investment if the proposed contract would be a regulated contract."*

*But the PR says that the Supplier did exactly that at the Time of Sale – saying, in summary, that Mr H was told by the Supplier that Fractional Club membership was the type of investment that would only increase in value.*

*The term “investment” is not defined in the Timeshare Regulations. But for the purposes of this provisional decision, and by reference to the decided authorities, an investment is a transaction in which money or other property is laid out in the expectation or hope of financial gain or profit.*

*A share in the Allocated Property clearly constituted an investment as it offered Mr H the prospect of a financial return – whether or not, like all investments, that was more than what he first put into it. But it is important to note at this stage that the fact that Fractional Club membership included an investment element did not, itself, transgress the prohibition in Regulation 14(3). That provision prohibits the marketing and selling of a timeshare contract as an investment. It doesn’t prohibit the mere existence of an investment element in a timeshare contract or prohibit the marketing and selling of such a timeshare contract per se.*

*In other words, the Timeshare Regulations did not ban products such as the Fractional Club. They just regulated how such products were marketed and sold.*

*To conclude, therefore, that Fractional Club membership was marketed or sold to Mr H as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3), I have to be persuaded that it was more likely than not that the Supplier marketed and/or sold membership to him as an investment, i.e. told him or led him to believe that Fractional Club membership offered him the prospect of a financial gain (i.e., a profit) given the facts and circumstances of this complaint.*

*There is competing evidence in this complaint as to whether Fractional Club membership was marketed and/or sold by the Supplier at the Time of Sale as an investment in breach of regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations.*

*On the one hand, it is clear that the Supplier made efforts to avoid specifically describing membership of the Fractional Club as an ‘investment’ or quantifying to prospective purchasers, such as Mr H, the financial value of their share in the net sales proceeds of the Allocated Property along with the investment considerations, risks and rewards attached to them.*

*On the other hand, I acknowledge that the Supplier’s sales process left open the possibility that the sales representative may have positioned Fractional Club membership as an investment. So, I accept that it’s equally possible that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to Mr H as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3).*

*However, whether or not there was a breach of the relevant prohibition by the Supplier is not ultimately determinative of the outcome in this complaint for reasons I will come on to shortly. And with that being the case, it’s not necessary to make a formal finding on that particular issue for the purposes of this decision.*

***Was the credit relationship between the Lender and the Consumer rendered unfair?***

*Having found that it was possible that the Supplier breached Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations at the Time of Sale, I now need to consider what impact that breach had on the fairness of the credit relationship between Mr H and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement as the case law on Section 140A makes it clear that regulatory breaches do not automatically create unfairness for the purposes of that provision. Such breaches and their consequences (if there are any) must be considered in the round, rather than in a narrow or technical way.*

*Indeed, it seems to me that, if I am to conclude that a breach of Regulation 14(3) led to a credit relationship between Mr H and the Lender that was unfair to him and warranted relief as a result, whether the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) led him to enter into the Purchase Agreement and the Credit Agreement is an important consideration.*

*The PR have provided an unsigned and undated witness statement from Mr H, which they say was drafted in June 2018. The PR hasn't provided any evidence to support that, but based on the information available, it seems likely to have been prepared in advance of a claim Mr H was making through the Spanish courts.*

*I've considered this testimony, which is in the form of certain questions being asked of Mr H in relation to his purchases from the Supplier, and his answers to those.*

*In particular, I can see that Mr H was asked "What was your reason for signing up for the product and in case of upgrades, what made you upgrade?". And, in relation to this Time of Sale, he said:*

*"After the initial purchase, I studied [the Supplier's] website and it became apparent that we wouldn't be able to have as many holidays each year that [sic] we had been led to believe we could, so having been through the second sales presentation (a condition of the complimentary one week holiday that we were given as part of the original purchase) I was persuaded to upgrade to purchase a higher number of points.*

*Since the upgrade we have had issues with availability and accommodation standards and bitterly regret spending the initial (let alone the upgrade) purchase fees."*

*So, in his own words, Mr H has explained that he purchased the membership due to the holidays it could provide and wanted to increase his points in order to take holidays.*

*Indeed, holidays are the focus of his testimony, describing in quite some detail issues following the purchase such as availability and the quality of accommodation i.e. how the membership functioned as a holiday product.*

*This also aligns with the sales note made by the Supplier at the Time of Sale which states that Mr H was making the purchase in order to have more points:*

TSW Contact Note	Pgz	15/02/2016	17:18	Client Liaison
<p><i>Note: Mr upgrading FPOC for more points &amp; the benefits of a multi fraction. Wife never signs although on holiday with him &amp; the children. Consolidated finance which Mr says he may try to change in a few months. Advised that for the length of term it is a good offer &amp; overpayments without penalty can be made. Accelerated payments facility shown. OK with that. Aware that MFees have risen. Is ok with that but felt not covered enough by Sales. Confirmed that he was still happy to go ahead with the purchase &amp; had felt no pressure. RHD 19/02/16</i></p>				

*So, on my reading of the evidence before me, the prospect of a financial gain from Fractional Club membership was not an important and motivating factor when he decided to go ahead with his purchase. That doesn't mean he wasn't interested in a share in the Allocated*

*Property. After all, that wouldn't be surprising given the nature of the product at the centre of this complaint. But as Mr H himself doesn't persuade me that his purchase was motivated by his share in the Allocated Property and the possibility of a profit, I don't think a breach of Regulation 14(3) by the Supplier was likely to have been material to the decision Mr H ultimately made.*

*On balance, therefore, even if the Supplier had marketed or sold the Fractional Club membership as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations, I am not persuaded that Mr H's decision to purchase Fractional Club membership at the Time of Sale was motivated by the prospect of a financial gain (i.e., a profit). On the contrary, I think the evidence suggests he would have pressed ahead with his purchase whether or not there had been a breach of Regulation 14(3). And for that reason, I do not think the credit relationship between Mr H and the Lender was unfair to him even if the Supplier had breached Regulation 14(3).*

### ***The Supplier's alleged breach of Spanish Law and its implications on the Credit Agreement***

---

*The PR argues that, because the Purchase Agreement was unlawful under Spanish law in light of certain information failings by the Supplier, I should treat that Agreement and the Credit Agreement as rescinded by Mr H and award him compensation accordingly – in keeping with the judgment of the UK's Supreme Court in Durkin v DSG Retail [2014] UKSC 21 ('Durkin').*

*But here, I note that the Purchase Agreement is governed by English law. So, it isn't at all clear that Spanish law would be held relevant if the validity of the Purchase Agreement were litigated between its parties and the Lender in an English court. For example, in Diamond Resorts Europe and Others (Case C-632/21), the European Court of Justice ruled that, because the claimant lived in England and the timeshare contract governed by English law, it was English law that applied, not Spanish, even though the latter was more favourable to the claimant in ways that resemble the matters seemingly relied upon by the PR.*

*What's more, as Mr H has gone some way to taking advantage of the Purchase and Credit Agreements, an English court might hesitate to uphold a claim for rescission of either Agreement because there are equitable reasons to do so.*

*Overall, therefore, in the absence of a successful English court ruling on a timeshare case paid for using a point-of-sale loan on similar facts to this complaint, and given the facts and circumstances of this complaint, I'm not persuaded that it would be fair or reasonable to uphold it for this reason.*

So, in conclusion, given the facts and circumstances of this complaint, I did not think that the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with Mr H's Section 75 claim, and I was not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with him under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to him for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA. And having taken everything into account, I could see no other reason why it would be fair or reasonable to direct the Lender to compensate him.

The Lender responded to the PD and accepted it. The PR also responded – they did not accept the PD and provided some further comments and evidence they wish to be considered.

Having received the relevant responses from both parties, I'm now finalising my decision.

### ***The legal and regulatory context***

In considering what is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of the complaint, I am required under DISP 3.6.4R to take into account: relevant (i) law and regulations; (ii) regulators' rules, guidance and standards; and (iii) codes of practice; and (where appropriate), what I consider to have been good industry practice at the relevant time.

The legal and regulatory context that I think is relevant to this complaint is, in many ways, no different to that shared in several hundred published ombudsman decisions on very similar complaints – which can be found on the Financial Ombudsman Service's website. And with that being the case, it is not necessary to set out that context in detail here. But I would add that the following regulatory rules/guidance are also relevant:

The Consumer Credit Sourcebook ('CONC') – Found in the Financial Conduct Authority's (the 'FCA') Handbook of Rules and Guidance

Below are the most relevant provisions and/or guidance as they were at the relevant time:

- CONC 3.7.3 [R]
- CONC 4.5.3 [R]
- CONC 4.5.2 [G]

#### The FCA's Principles

The rules on consumer credit sit alongside the wider obligations of firms, such as the Principles for Businesses ('PRIN'). Set out below are those that are most relevant to this complaint:

- Principle 6
- Principle 7
- Principle 8

#### **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.

Following the responses from both parties, I've considered the case afresh and having done so, I've reached the same decision as that which I outlined in my provisional findings, for broadly the same reasons.

Again, my role as an Ombudsman isn't to address every single point which has been made to date, but to decide what is fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint. If I haven't commented on, or referred to, something that either party has said, this doesn't mean I haven't considered it.

Rather, I've focused here on addressing what I consider to be the key issues in deciding this complaint and explaining the reasons for reaching my final decision.

The PR's further comments in response to the PD in the main relate to the issue of whether the credit relationship between Mr H and the Lender was unfair. In particular, the PR has provided further comments in relation to whether the membership was sold to Mr H as an investment at the Time of Sale. They've also now argued for the first time that the payment of a commission by the Lender to the Supplier led to an unfair credit relationship. And, they've provided further comments in relation to the Supplier's alleged breach of Spanish law.

As outlined in my PD, the PR originally raised various other points of complaint, all of which I addressed at that time. But they didn't make any further comments in relation to those in their response to my PD. Indeed, they haven't said they disagree with any of my provisional

conclusions in relation to those other points. And since I haven't been provided with anything more in relation to those other points by either party, I see no reason to change my conclusions in relation to them as set out in my PD. So, I'll focus here on the PR's points raised in response.

### **Section 140A of the CCA: did the Lender participate in an unfair credit relationship?**

#### The Supplier's alleged breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare regulations

In my PD, I noted that what Mr H had said, in his own words, showed he made the purchase for the holidays it could provide, and wanted to increase his points in order to take them. And, I noted that this aligned with the sales note made by the Supplier at the Time of Sale.

So, I wasn't persuaded that the evidence suggested that Mr H purchased Fractional Club membership in whole or in part down to any breach of Regulation 14(3).

In response, the PR said that just because a purchaser was also interested in taking holidays with the Supplier, that does not preclude them also being motivated to take out Fractional Club membership by any investment element. And I agree. Indeed, I would find it surprising if any members were not interested in taking holidays, given the nature of the product.

But, what I have to consider here is whether any breach by the Supplier of Regulation 14(3) at the Time of Sale was material to Mr H's purchasing decision. And, for the reasons I've already explained in my PD, I'm simply not persuaded that it was.

The PR said they didn't generally consider sales notes from the Supplier to be reliable because, for example, these are 'informal' and were often written to highlight the performance of the salesperson rather than being an objective or comprehensive account of the discussion. I acknowledge what the PR has said here but ultimately, they haven't said this particular sales note in this case was inaccurate. They haven't said, for example, this isn't what Mr H told the Supplier at the time the note was made or that he remembers telling them something different, and what that was.

The PR said they were concerned that I'd put more weight on the sale note than on Mr H's own recollections. But, as I've already outlined, I have relied on what Mr H has said in his own words about the reason he purchased the membership i.e. holidays. And the sale note, as I noted in my PD, doesn't contradict this.

So, ultimately, for the above reasons, along with those I already explained in my PD, I remain unpersuaded that any breach of Regulation 14(3) was material to Mr H's purchasing decision.

The PR also said that in the judgment handed down in *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*, it was not challenged that the product in question was marketed and sold as an investment. But, as I explained in my provisional decision, the Timeshare Regulations did not ban products such as the Fractional Club. They just regulated how such products were marketed and sold. And the judgment referred to did not make a blanket finding that all such products were mis-sold in the way the PR appears to be suggesting. Any complaint needs to be considered in the light of its specific circumstances. So just because the complaints that were subject to judicial review were upheld, it does not follow I must (or should) also uphold Mr H's complaint.

So, as I said before, even if the Supplier had marketed or sold the membership as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3) (which I still make no finding on here), I'm not

persuaded Mr H's decision to make the purchase was motivated by the prospect of a financial gain. So, I still don't think the credit relationship between Mr H and the Lender was unfair to him for this reason.

#### The provision of information by the Supplier at the Time of Sale

The PR says that a payment of commission from the Lender to the Supplier at the Time of Sale should lead me to uphold this complaint because, simply put, information in relation to that payment went undisclosed at the Time of Sale.

As both sides already know, the Supreme Court handed down an important judgment on 1 August 2025 in a series of cases concerned with the issue of commission: *Johnson v FirstRand Bank Ltd, Wrench v FirstRand Bank Ltd and Hopcraft v Close Brothers Ltd [2025] UKSC 33 ('Hopcraft, Johnson and Wrench')*.

The Supreme Court ruled that, in each of the three cases, the commission payments made to car dealers by lenders were legal, as claims for the tort of bribery, or the dishonest assistance of a breach of fiduciary duty, had to be predicated on the car dealer owing a fiduciary duty to the consumer, which the car dealers did not owe. A "disinterested duty", as described in *Wood v Commercial First Business Ltd & ors and Business Mortgage Finance 4 plc v Pengelly [2021] EWCA Civ 471*, is not enough.

However, the Supreme Court held that the credit relationship between the lender and Mr Johnson was unfair under Section 140A of the CCA because of the commission paid by the lender to the car dealer. The main reasons for coming to that conclusion included, amongst other things, the following factors:

1. The size of the commission (as a percentage of the total charge for credit). In Mr Johnson's case it was 55%. This was "so high" and "a powerful indication that the relationship...was unfair" (see paragraph 327);
2. The failure to disclose the commission; and
3. The concealment of the commercial tie between the car dealer and the lender.

The Supreme Court also confirmed that the following factors, in what was a non-exhaustive list, will normally be relevant when assessing whether a credit relationship was/is unfair under Section 140A of the CCA:

1. The size of the commission as a proportion of the charge for credit;
2. The way in which commission is calculated (a discretionary commission arrangement, for example, may lead to higher interest rates);
3. The characteristics of the consumer;
4. The extent of any disclosure and the manner of that disclosure (which, insofar as Section 56 of the CCA is engaged, includes any disclosure by a supplier when acting as a broker); and
5. Compliance with the regulatory rules.

From my reading of the Supreme Court's judgment in *Hopcraft, Johnson and Wrench*, it sets out principles which apply to credit brokers other than car dealer-credit brokers. So, when considering allegations of undisclosed payments of commission like the one in this complaint, *Hopcraft, Johnson and Wrench* is relevant law that I'm required to consider under Rule 3.6.4 of the Financial Conduct Authority's Dispute Resolution Rules ('DISP').

But I don't think *Hopcraft, Johnson and Wrench* assists Mr H in arguing that [his/her/their] credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to him for reasons relating to commission given the facts and circumstances of this complaint.

Based on what I've seen, the Supplier's role as a credit broker wasn't a separate service and distinct from its role as the seller of timeshares. It was simply a means to an end in the Supplier's overall pursuit of a successful timeshare sale. I can't see that the Supplier gave an undertaking – either expressly or impliedly – to put to one side its commercial interests in pursuit of that goal when arranging the Credit Agreement. And as it wasn't acting as an agent of Mr H but as the supplier of contractual rights he obtained under the Purchase Agreement, the transaction doesn't strike me as one with features that suggest the Supplier had an obligation of 'loyalty' to him when arranging the Credit Agreement and thus a fiduciary duty.

I haven't seen anything to suggest that the Lender and Supplier were tied to one another contractually or commercially in a way that wasn't properly disclosed to [Consumer], nor have I seen anything that persuades me that the commission arrangement between them gave the Supplier a choice over the interest rate that led Mr H into a credit agreement that cost disproportionately more than it otherwise could have.

What's more, in stark contrast to the facts of Mr Johnson's case, as I understand it, no payment between the Lender and the Supplier, such as a commission, was payable when the Credit Agreement was arranged at the Time of Sale. And with that being the case, even if there were information failings at that time and regulatory failings as a result (which I make no formal finding on), I'm not currently persuaded that the commercial arrangements between the Supplier and the Lender were likely to have led to a sufficiently extreme inequality of knowledge that rendered the credit relationship unfair to Mr H.

## **S140A conclusion**

Given all of the factors I've looked at in this part of my decision, and having taken all of them into account, I'm not persuaded that the credit relationship between Mr H and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement was unfair to him. So, I don't think it is fair or reasonable that I uphold this complaint on that basis.

### **Commission: The Alternative Grounds of Complaint**

While I've found that Mr H's credit relationship with the Lender wasn't unfair to him for reasons relating to the commission arrangements between it and the Supplier, two of the grounds on which I came to that conclusion also constitute separate and freestanding complaints to Mr H's complaint about an unfair credit relationship. So, for completeness, I've considered those grounds on that basis here.

The first ground relates to whether the Lender is liable for the dishonest assistance of a breach of fiduciary duty by the Supplier because it took a payment of commission from the Lender without telling Mr H (i.e., secretly). And the second relates to the Lender's compliance with the regulatory guidance in place at the Time of Sale insofar as it was relevant to disclosing the commission arrangements between them.

However, for the reasons I set out above, I'm not persuaded that the Supplier – when acting as credit broker – owed Mr H a fiduciary duty. So, the remedies that might be available at law in relation to the payment of secret commission aren't, in my view, available to him. And while it's possible that the Lender failed to follow the regulatory guidance in place at the Time of Sale insofar as it was relevant to disclosing the commission arrangements between it and the Supplier, I don't think any such failure on the Lender's part is itself a reason to

uphold this complaint because, for the reasons I also set out above, I think he would still have taken out the loan to fund his purchase at the Time of Sale had there been more adequate disclosure of the commission arrangements that applied at that time.

### **Other points**

Here, the PR has asked us to determine the rights and obligations of the Lender based on the outcome of a court case in Spain. In my PD, I said that in the absence of a judgment in an English jurisdiction on this issue, I was not persuaded it was fair and reasonable to conclude the loan agreement was able to be set aside. I remain of this view for the following reasons:

- The Lender wasn't a party to the proceedings the PR has referred to, so its' rights under the Credit Agreement have not been determined.
- I still think that the Purchase Agreement is governed by English law for the reason already set out in my PD. The PR has pointed to a different decision of the European Court of Justice that points the other way. But in the absence of any authorities under English law, I'm still not persuaded that (1) the Purchase Agreement, properly governed by English law, could be avoided following the Spanish Judgment to which the PR refers and (2) that the Credit Agreement was also something that could be successfully avoided.
- And lastly, in any event, the PR has not provided any arguments as to why the relevant agreements could be set aside given Mr H's use of the membership.

So again, I'm still not persuaded that it would be fair or reasonable to uphold the complaint for this reason.

### **Conclusion**

---

In conclusion, given the facts and circumstances of this complaint, I do not think that the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with Mr H's Section 75 claim, and I am not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with him under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to him for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA. And having taken everything into account, I see no other reason why it would be fair or reasonable to direct the Lender to compensate him.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons set out above, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr H to accept or reject my decision before 29 December 2025.

Fiona Mallinson  
**Ombudsman**