

The Complaint

Mr P's complaint is, in essence, that Mitsubishi HC Capital UK PLC trading as Novuna Personal Finance (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.

Background to the Complaint

Mr P, and another party, purchased membership of a timeshare (the 'Fractional Club') from a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') on 20 May 2015 (the 'Time of Sale'). They entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 1,500 fractional points at a cost of £12,521 (the 'Purchase Agreement').

Mr P paid for their Fractional Club membership by taking finance of £12,521 from the Lender (the 'Credit Agreement'). Whilst the Purchase Agreement was in joint names, Mr P is the only eligible claimant (and complainant) under the Credit Agreement. For that reason, I shall refer to Mr P only throughout this decision.

Fractional Club membership was asset backed – which meant it gave Mr P 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 P – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender on 16 November 2022 (the 'Letter of Complaint') to raise a number of different concerns. As those concerns have not changed since they were first raised, and as both sides are familiar with them, it is not necessary to repeat them in detail here beyond the summary above.

The Lender dealt with Mr P's concerns as a complaint and issued its final response letter on 29 May 2025, 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 P 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'). In that decision, I said:

"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 provisionally decided – and why

I have considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what is fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint. And having done that, I do not think this complaint should be upheld.

However, before I explain why, I want to make it clear that my role as an Ombudsman is not to address every single point that has been made to date. Instead, it is to decide what is fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint. So, if I have not commented on, or referred to, something that either party has said, that does not mean I have not considered it.

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 P could make against the Supplier.

The Lender does not dispute that the relevant conditions are met, and I am satisfied that they are. There are, though, certain time limits that apply – and I think mean this means Mr P’s claim would have been time-barred.

The Limitation Act 1980 sets out limitation periods, or time limits, for bringing various types of legal claim. For a claim based on contract, it is not generally possible to start court action more than six years after the cause of action arose. If a claim is brought too late, the respondent is likely to have a complete defence to the claim on that basis.

For claims relating to misrepresentation, the time limit would typically be six years from

the date the claimant suffers damage as a result of the misrepresentation. For example, entering into a contract – and incurring liabilities – when they would otherwise not have done. Mr P’s claim under Section 75 is that but for the Supplier’s various alleged misrepresentations, he would not have entered into the Purchase Agreement (and, therefore, the Credit Agreement). So, it is the date on which he entered into those agreements that his cause of action arose, meaning he had six years from that date within which to bring this claim.

Mr P entered into the Purchase Agreement and Credit Agreement on 20 May 2015. He raised his claim under Section 75 within the Letter of Complaint dated 16 November 2022 – more than six years later.

That being the case, I do not think the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably in declining the claim. However, I have considered whether these alleged misrepresentations could have been something that caused an unfair credit relationship.

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

There are other aspects of the sales process that, being the subject of dissatisfaction, I must explore with Section 140A in mind if I am to consider this complaint in full – which is what I have done next.

Having considered the entirety of the credit relationship between Mr P and the Lender along with all of the circumstances of the complaint, I do not 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 in relation to Fractional Club membership, including the contractual documentation and disclaimers made by the Supplier;*
- 3. The commission arrangements between the Lender and the Supplier at the Time of Sale and the disclosure of those arrangements;*
- 4. Evidence provided by both parties on what was likely to have been said and/or done at the Time of Sale;*
- 5. The inherent probabilities of the sale given its circumstances; and, when relevant*
- 6. 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 P and the Lender given his circumstances at the Time of Sale.

The Supplier’s sales & marketing practices at the Time of Sale

Mr P’s complaint about the Lender being party to an unfair credit relationship was made for several reasons.

However, I have firstly considered whether the misrepresentations he alleges were made by the Supplier in the context of his Section 75 claim could have caused any unfairness for the purposes of Section 140A.

It was said in the Letter of Complaint that Fractional Club membership had been misrepresented by the Supplier at the Time of Sale because Mr P was:

- 1. Told that he had purchased an investment that would “considerably appreciate in*

- value”.
2. Promised a considerable return on his investment because he was told that he would own a share in a property that would considerably increase in value.
 3. Told that he could sell his Fractional Club membership to the Supplier or easily to third parties at a profit.
 4. Made to believe that he would have access to “the holiday apartment” at any time all year round.

However, neither points 1 nor 2 strike me as misrepresentations even if such representations had been made by the Supplier (which I make no formal finding on). Telling prospective members that they were investing their money because they were buying a fraction or share of one of the Supplier’s properties was not untrue. And even if the Supplier’s sales representatives went further and suggested that the share in question would increase in value, perhaps considerably so, that sounds like nothing more than a honestly held opinion as there is not any accompanying evidence to persuade me that the relevant sales representative(s) said something that, while an opinion, amounted to a statement of fact that they did not hold or could not have reasonably held.

As for points 3 and 4, while it is possible that Fractional Club membership was misrepresented at the Time of Sale for one or both of those reasons, I do not think it is probable. He has given little to none of the colour or context necessary to demonstrate that the Supplier made false statements of existing fact and/or opinion. And as there is not any other evidence on file to support the suggestion that Fractional Club membership was misrepresented for these reasons, I do not think it was.

So, while I recognise that Mr P - and the PR - have concerns about the way in which Fractional Club membership was sold by the Supplier, I do not think this caused any unfairness in Mr P’s credit relationship with the Lender such that it warrants a remedy.

Turning to the points specifically raised in relation to the potential unfairness of the relationship between consumers and the Lender, the PR says, for instance, that the right checks were not carried out before the Lender lent to Mr P. I have not 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 P 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 P.

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 was not permitted to enforce the Credit Agreement. However, it looks to me like Mr P 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 does not look like it was unaffordable for him, even if the Credit Agreement was arranged by a broker that did not have the necessary permission to do so (which I make no formal finding on), I cannot see why that led to a financial loss for Mr P— 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 am not persuaded that it would be fair or reasonable to tell the Lender to compensate him, even if the loan was not arranged properly.

The PR also says that there was one or more unfair contract terms in the Purchase Agreement. But as I cannot see that any such terms were operated unfairly against Mr P

in practice, nor that any such terms led him to behave in a certain way to his detriment, I am 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 do not think that Mr P'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 is 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 P'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 P 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 P 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 does not 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 P 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 P, 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 is equally possible that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to Mr P 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 is not necessary to make a formal finding on that particular issue for the purposes of this decision.

Would the credit relationship between the Lender and Mr P have been rendered unfair to him had there been a breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations?

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 P 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 P 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.

But 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. To help me decide this point, I've carefully considered what Mr P has said in the course of his complaint about how the membership was sold to him and his motivation for taking it out.

The PR has provided a statement from Mr P containing his recollections from the Time of Sale. The statement is dated on 29 September 2022. We had not received a copy of this when Mr P's complaint was referred to our service, but this was shared after the Investigator requested this. I have carefully considered what Mr P has said and his potential motivations for taking this membership.

As I've stated above, it is said within the Letter of Complaint that Mr P was told that he had purchased an investment that would increase in value and was promised a considerable return. There was no further detail underpinning these statements within the Letter of Complaint.

The only reference Mr P makes, within his three-page statement, about how his membership was positioned as an investment is as follows:

“They also told us that we would own a share of the property and at the conclusion of our contract, the property would be sold and we would receive a percentage of the sale price, leaving us with a tidy profit. (Their words)”.

Mr P did not go into any further detail about this and it simply appears to be a description of what he may have been told by the sales representative. Taking this at face value, it appears that the prospect of a return was a factor in his decision to purchase the membership but Mr P does little to persuade me that this was the motivating factor in his decision to purchase and having considered everything on file, I do not think it was.

We have been given a copy of the sales note from the Time of Sale and this suggests that Mr P was offered to take over a family member’s membership, but it was for a fixed week and the note suggests Mr P wanted flexibility over holiday bookings. This may explain why Mr P opted for a Fractional Club membership.

In his witness statement, Mr P, in my opinion places much more emphasis on the holiday rights that his membership provided. Mr P described how the sales representatives described the types of holidays available to him. The Supplier shared information on a bi-annual Fractional membership as he could not afford a membership which provided him with yearly holidays. So, it seems to me the types of holidays the Supplier had to offer appealed to Mr P and he agreed to a membership that was affordable to him.

Mr P then goes on to explain issues he experienced with availability, accepting that he has been able to book holidays on certain occasions. I note Mr P’s concerns around availability, but from what I know about the Supplier’s sale process, the paperwork given to Mr P would have made it clear that the availability of holidays was/is subject to demand. The Lender has also shared a call recording between Mr P and the Supplier on 2 December 2024.¹ Mr P reiterates his main concern with the membership was surrounding his ability to book holidays and did not make any reference to this membership being sold as an investment.

At the time this conversation took place, Mr P had gone on to upgrade his membership in September 2018 so I assume Mr P’s concerns about availability stem from his whole experience since becoming a member of the Supplier. From the sales notes, it appears the reason why he upgraded his membership in September 2018 was because he wanted more points to allow him to holiday every year rather than every other year. Although I am not considering Mr P’s purchase in 2018 in my decision, I think the reason why he decided to upgrade later, reinforces my opinion that Mr P was interested in the holidays the Supplier had to offer and pressed ahead with this purchase on that basis, irrespective of any promotion of the investment element by the Supplier.

That does not mean he was not interested in a share in the Allocated Property. After all, that would not be surprising given the nature of the product at the centre of this complaint. But as Mr P himself does not persuade me that his purchase was motivated by his share in the Allocated Property and the possibility of a profit, I do not think a breach of Regulation 14(3) by the Supplier was likely to have been material to the decision Mr P 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 P’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

¹ Neither the PR or Mr P requested a copy of this call recording in response to my PD.

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 P and the Lender was unfair to him even if the Supplier had breached Regulation 14(3).

Section 140A: Conclusion

Given all of the factors I have looked at in this part of my decision, and having taken all of them into account, I am not persuaded that the credit relationship between Mr P and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement was unfair to him. And as things currently stand, I do not think it would be fair or reasonable that I uphold this complaint on that basis.

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

The PR argues that, because the Supplier's Spanish based sales companies have closed, Mr P will not recover any amounts that are expected to be awarded by the Spanish court. But this is of no impact on the complaint because (1) I cannot see that the Supplier (i.e., company that entered into the Purchase Agreement) is itself the subject of a court judgment in Mr P's favour nor can I see that the Lender has been party to any court proceedings and (2) even if he had a claim for something, there is no explanation as to why the Lender would be responsible to answer it.

Overall, given the facts and circumstances of this complaint, I am not persuaded that it would be fair or reasonable to uphold it for this reason.

Overall 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 P's Section 75 claim. I am not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with him under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase 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."

The Lender responded to the PD and accepted it.

The PR also responded. It did not accept the PD and provided some further comments it wanted me to take into account.

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

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 only relate to the issue of whether the credit relationship between Mr P and the Lender was unfair. In particular, the PR has provided further comments in relation to whether the membership was sold to Mr P as an investment at the Time of Sale. It has 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.

As outlined in my PD, the PR originally raised various other points of complaint, all of which I addressed at that time. But it didn't make any further comments in relation to those in their response to my PD. Indeed, it hasn't said it disagrees 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 PR has highlighted under Section 140B (9) of the CCA, the burden of proof falls on the Lender to disprove the allegation that its relationship with Mr P was unfair. I agree that this is correct, placing a burden on lenders during the process of litigation. That does not mean, though, that the Lender – or I – should take a claim at face value. There remains an onus on Mr P to provide some evidence for the claim he is making, despite the overall burden of proof resting with the Lender, as was set out in the judgment in *Smith and another v Royal Bank of Scotland plc* [2023] UKSC 34 at paragraph 40. I also remind both parties that it is my role to make findings on what I consider to be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of any given complaint.

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

In its response to my PD, the PR has reasserted its view that the Supplier marketed the Fractional Club membership to Mr P as an investment and that this was a motivating factor in his decision.

I accepted in my PD that the membership may well have been marketed as an investment to Mr P in breach of the prohibition in Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations. I also explained that while the Supplier's sales processes left open the possibility that the sales representative may have positioned Fractional Club membership as an investment, it wasn't necessary for me to make a finding on this as it is not determinative of the outcome of the complaint. I explained that regulatory breaches do not automatically create unfairness and that such breaches and their consequences (if there are any) must be considered in the round, rather than in a narrow or technical way. The PR's response to my PD hasn't changed my view of this, and so whether the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) led Mr P to enter into the Purchase Agreement and the Credit Agreement remains an important consideration.

In my PD I explained the reasons why I didn't think any breach of Regulation 14(3) had led Mr P to proceed with his purchase. In short, I was not persuaded that his decision was motivated by the prospect of a financial gain (i.e., a profit). In reaching that view, I took into account all of the available information and evidence I received from all parties, including the sales note. The PR raised some concerns over my reliance of the sales note stating that they are not an official transcript and pointing out that these notes were left by same sales representatives who allegedly sold Mr P's membership to him in breach of Regulation 14(3).

I don't disagree with some of the comments the PR has made but I didn't reach my conclusion based on the sales note alone. Like I said, I considered all of the available evidence, including Mr P's testimony, but for the reasons set out in my PD, I didn't think the investment element of Fractional Club membership was the motivation for Mr P's purchase.

I recognise the PR has interpreted Mr P's testimony differently to how I have, and I have carefully considered its further comments. Ultimately though, they have not led me to a different conclusion.

The PR reiterates what Mr P says in his witness statement about how the sales representatives sold the membership. The PR says the investment element played an important part of the sales process and that the reference to the investment element by the sales representatives was a motivating factor in Mr P's decision to purchase. In my view, the PR's submissions seem to be conflating the issue of whether there was a breach of Regulation 14(3) at the Time of Sale and whether this was material to Mr P's purchasing decision. Having read Mr P's testimony, I don't think he clearly sets out his motivations to purchase. As I explained in my PD, the case law on Section 140A makes it clear that regulatory breaches do not automatically create unfairness for the purposes of that provision. And, for the reasons I've given in my PD and those explained above, I'm not persuaded that any such breach by the Supplier at the Time of Sale (if there was one) was material to Mr P's purchasing decision.

The PR also says that as the Supplier's pricing sheet set out the "Unit share" Mr P acquired under his Fractional Club membership, this shows the investment element played "quite an important role" in convincing him to purchase it. I don't agree with that analysis. The pricing sheet was a proforma document that captured a number of details about the purchase in a standardised format. The fact the unit share acquired was recorded indicates the purchase included an investment element. But it follows that the Supplier would have recorded that information irrespective of the customer's motivations for making the purchase. So I don't consider this document offers an insight into Mr P's motivation for making his purchase.

The PR objects to the approach I've taken in assessing this aspect of the complaint, believing that I have detracted from the judgment in *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*² and the case law that contributed to it, by requiring Mr P to have been "primarily or mainly motivated" by the investment element in order to uphold the complaint. But I did not make such a finding. I said that, in my view, Mr P was interested in the holiday options offered by the Supplier – which was a factor in my overall conclusion in light of all the available evidence that he would, on balance, have pressed ahead with his purchase of the Fractional Club membership even if there had been a breach of Regulation 14(3).

So for the reasons given in my PD and above, I still do not think that any breach of Regulation 14(3), if there was one, was material to Mr P's decision to purchase the Fractional Club membership.

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.

² R (on the application of Shawbrook Bank Ltd) v Financial Ombudsman Service Ltd and R (on the application of Clydesdale Financial Services Ltd (t/a Barclays Partner Finance)) v Financial Ombudsman Service [2023] EWHC 1069 (Admin) ('Shawbrook & BPF v FOS').

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 P in arguing that his credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to him for reasons relating to commission given the facts and circumstances of this complaint.

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 Mr P, 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 P into a credit agreement that cost disproportionately more than it otherwise could have.

I acknowledge that it's possible that the Lender and the Supplier failed to follow the regulatory guidance in place at the Time of Sale insofar as it was relevant to disclosing the commission arrangements between them.

But as I've said before, 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. And with that being the case, it isn't necessary to make a formal finding on that because, even if the Lender and the Supplier failed to follow the relevant regulatory guidance at the Time of Sale, it is for the reasons set out below that I don't currently think any such failure is itself a reason to find the credit relationship in question unfair to Mr P.

In stark contrast to the facts of Mr Johnson's case, from my understanding of how the Supplier operated at the time, the amount of commission paid by the Lender to the Supplier for arranging the Credit Agreement that Mr P entered into was no more than 0.91%. So, had he known at the Time of Sale that the Supplier was going to be paid a flat rate of commission at that level, I'm not currently persuaded that he either wouldn't have understood that or would have otherwise questioned the size of the payment at that time. After all, Mr P wanted Fractional Club membership and had no obvious means of his own to pay for it. And at such a low level, the impact of commission on the cost of the credit he needed for a timeshare he wanted doesn't strike me as disproportionate. So, I think he would still have taken out the loan to fund his purchase at the Time of Sale had the amount of commission been disclosed.

What's more, based on what I've seen so far, 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 P 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.

Overall, therefore, I'm not currently persuaded that the commission 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 P.

Section 140A: 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 P and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement was unfair to him. And as things currently stand, I don't think it would be fair or reasonable that I uphold this complaint on that basis.

Commission: The Alternative Grounds of Complaint

While I've found that Mr P'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 P'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 P (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 P 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.

Overall 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 P'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 P to accept or reject my decision before 3 March 2026.

Sameena Ali
Ombudsman