

The complaint

Mr S complains about inaccurate information on his hire purchase agreement with N.I.I.B. Group Limited trading as Northridge Finance (“Northridge”).

What happened

Both parties are familiar with the background of this complaint so I will only summarise what happened briefly here.

In March 2022, Mr S entered into a ‘personal contract purchase’ type of hire purchase agreement to acquire a new car. He used a credit broker (D) to source the finance, and the finance provider was Northridge. The agreement was for 48 months.

Mr S has said that, towards the end of 2024, he was contacted by Northridge and asked to check his agreement. Having done so, Mr S noticed that the incorrect model of car was shown on the agreement, although the registration number and vehicle identification number (VIN) shown was for the car he had acquired. He also noticed that the mileage allowance on the agreement was 12,000 miles per year, and Mr S was sure he’d asked for this to be 14,000 miles a year.

He complained to Northridge and asked for the incorrect information to be amended. Northridge responded and confirmed to Mr S that he had signed the agreement confirming he wanted an allowance of 12,000 miles per year and has also confirmed this information during a call with D prior to entering the agreement. In respect of the incorrect model of car, Northridge said Mr S was aware of the car he was buying. They didn’t really comment on the inaccurate information shown on the finance agreement.

Mr S brought his complaint to our service. Our investigator upheld it. She said she thought an administration error had occurred when the finance agreement was being produced, but that Mr S was in possession of the car he thought he was acquiring. She said the information provided confirmed Mr S had agreed to a mileage allowance of 12,000 a year. She asked Northridge to amend Mr S’s finance agreement to show the correct model of car and send Mr S the amended document. She also asked Northridge to pay £100 compensation to Mr S to reflect the upset the error had caused him.

Northridge agreed and said they could amend the existing finance agreement by issuing an addendum to it, which they would provide to Mr S in writing and hold on their own files, so there would be no confusion when the agreement ended and if Mr S decided to hand the car back.

Mr S didn’t agree. He maintained that he had asked for an allowance of 14,000 miles per year.

As Mr S hasn’t accepted, the complaint has been passed to me to decide.

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.

When considering what is fair and reasonable, I'm required to take into account: relevant law and regulations, relevant regulatory rules, guidance and standards and codes of practice.

As the hire purchase agreement entered by Mr S is a regulated consumer credit agreement this service is able to consider complaints relating to it. As the car was supplied to Mr S under a hire purchase agreement, Northridge also have responsibility for anything D said or did prior to Mr S's entry into the agreement.

In this case, there is no doubt that the model of car shown on the hire purchase agreement is different to the model of car Mr S acquired when he entered into the agreement. Mr S is in possession of the car he wanted, and the registration number and VIN are for the car he has in his possession – but the model shown on the agreement doesn't match the sales invoice provided to Northridge by D. However, I'm satisfied the incorrect model on the agreement is as a result of an administration error, rather than any misrepresentation. It seems that Mr S and D had a few conversations about different models of car, and different finance options – and it seems more likely than not that one of those different models has been entered onto Mr S's agreement in error.

I can understand why this might now be causing Mr S some worry. He is planning to hand the car back at the end of the agreement term and is concerned that he will be questioned by Northridge as to why the model he's handing back is different to the model of car shown on the agreement. To avoid any confusion, Northridge have offered to amend the existing agreement by issuing an addendum to it and providing this addendum to Mr S in writing. They will also make sure a copy of the addendum to the agreement is held on their files, so there will be no confusion when it comes to Mr S handing the car back. I'm satisfied that is a reasonable thing for Northridge to do in the circumstances, and I'm more satisfied than not that this will avoid any unnecessary worry to Mr S when the time comes to decide what to do with the car at the end of the agreement.

Mr S has also said that he asked for his mileage allowance to be 14,000 a year under the agreement, and that several conversations about this were had with D's agent at the time he was finalising the agreement. Northridge have only been able to obtain details of one call between Mr S and D's agent and have provided a transcript of that. Within that call, Mr S is asked to confirm the model of car he's acquiring, and the mileage allowance he's accepting. Mr S confirms the agreement is to be set up with an annual allowance of 12,000 miles, and this is what is shown on his agreement. In addition to the phone call, Mr S was also provided with the pre-contract credit information (PCCI) from D prior to entering the agreement. I'm satisfied the PCCI and the finance agreement noted the mileage allowance in a prominent, clear, and not misleading way.

Based on what I've been provided with in this case, I'm satisfied Mr S should have been aware of the mileage allowance on his agreement and had the opportunities to correct this if he felt it was incorrect, prior to accepting it. I won't be asking Northridge to do any more in this regard.

Mr S has been caused some worry since discovering the model of the car on the agreement didn't match the model of the car he had been supplied with. It's clearly been a troubling time for him. Our investigator has asked Northridge to pay Mr S £100 compensation to reflect the worry he's been caused, and I'm satisfied that's a fair resolution.

My final decision

For the reasons above, I uphold this complaint. N.I.I.B. Group Limited trading as Northridge Finance must:

- Issue an addendum to Mr S's hire purchase agreement to confirm the correct model of car.
- Pay Mr S £100 to reflect the upset this matter has caused him.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr S to accept or reject my decision before 25 February 2026.

Kevin Parmenter
Ombudsman