

The complaint

Loans 2 Go Limited provided Miss C with the following loans.

Details	Date	Amount	Term (months)	Monthly repayments
Loan one	May 2019	£500	18	£114.28
Loan two	April 2021	£800	18	£182.84
Loan three	February 2022	£400	18	£82.22
Loan four	July 2022	£375	18	£77.08

Miss C says the credit 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.

Having done so, I'm not upholding Miss C's complaint. I'll explain my reasoning below.

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 C's case.

I've decided that the loans were provided fairly, taking into account the following:

- I don't think the checks Loans 2 Go did before providing loan one were reasonable and proportionate given what it knew about Miss C's financial situation. I say this because Miss C was on a modest income and Loans 2 Go's affordability assessment, showed only around £100 per month remaining in disposable income, after all non-discretionary living expenses.
- If Loans 2 Go had done proportionate checks, I don't think it's likely these would have shown it was unfair to provide the credit to Miss C.
- Loans 2 Go verified information supplied by Miss C in her application and calculated figures to estimate living and other non-discretionary expenses. Where its own modelling suggested a different figure to what Miss C declared, it used 'worst case' figures.
- Having reviewed Miss C's bank statements for the three months preceding loan one, there is nothing to indicate that Loans 2 Go's assessment was incorrect and nothing to suggest that Miss C was likely to be unable to sustainably repay what she was being lent.
- For loans two, three and four, Loans 2 Go performed similar checks to when it approved loan one. After reviewing the details, I am satisfied that its checks were

reasonable and proportionate.

- Miss C's expenditure had increased by up to around £500 per month since the first loan was approved, but her income had increased by a greater amount. So there was nothing to indicate financial difficulties, or that Miss C would be unable to sustainably make the required repayments.
- I don't think Loans 2 Go acted unfairly in any other way.

This means I don't think Loans 2 Go did anything wrong when it provided the loans to Miss C.

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 Loans 2 Go lent irresponsibly to Miss C 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 C hoped for. But for the reasons above, I'm not asking Loans 2 Go to do anything to put things right.

My final decision

My final decision is that I'm not upholding this complaint about Loans 2 Go Limited.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss C to accept or reject my decision before 12 May 2026.

David Barker
Ombudsman