

The complaint

National Westminster Bank Public Limited Company (NatWest) provided Mr M with a £24,550 loan in September 2022. It had a 60-month term and the monthly repayments were £560.35. Mr M says the loan was provided irresponsibly.

What happened

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties, so I won't repeat them here. The facts aren't in dispute, so I'll focus on giving the reasons for my 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.

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 Mr M's case.

I've decided the loan was provided fairly for the following reasons:

- I think the checks NatWest did before providing the loan were reasonable and proportionate, having considered the size of the loan offered and what it knew about Mr M's financial situation.
- NatWest used information Mr M provided in his application, verified his income and gathered information from a credit reference agency (CRA) before agreeing to the loan. Its checks suggested he had a healthy disposable income after his essential spend and existing credit commitments. They also showed Mr M was managing his accounts well as there were no adverse markers reported.
- Based on the information NatWest gathered and what it knew about Mr M's circumstances, there was nothing to suggest he would be unable to sustainably repay what he'd been lent.
- Mr M has argued that his monthly expenditure was significantly more than NatWest had estimated. I've reviewed the information that was available at the time of the loan, and completed my own affordability assessment. Having done so, I am comfortable that, after verifying his income, NatWest took a reasonable approach for assessing his committed non-discretionary expenditure, using figures from Mr M's application where available, and reasonably calculated figures where they weren't.
- I don't think NatWest acted unfairly in any other way.

This means I don't think NatWest did anything wrong when it provided the loan to Mr M.

I've also considered whether the relationship might have been unfair to Mr M under section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974. However, for the reasons I've already explained, I

don't think NatWest lent irresponsibly to Mr M or otherwise treated him unfairly. I haven't seen anything to suggest that section 140A or anything else would, given the facts of this complaint, lead to a different outcome here.

I know this isn't the outcome Mr M hoped for. But for the reasons above, I'm not asking NatWest to do anything to put things right.

My final decision

My final decision is that I'm not upholding Mr M's complaint about National Westminster Bank Public Limited Company.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr M to accept or reject my decision before 9 March 2026.

David Barker
Ombudsman