

The complaint

Mr B complains that Steadypay Limited approved two credit facilities for him which he could not afford to repay.

Mr B also complains that Steadypay has treated him poorly including failing to apply reasonable adjustments due to his disabilities about which SteadyPay was aware. Mr B complains that Steadypay approached the debt collection communications in a manner which he says amounted to harassment.

Finally, Mr B complains that his credit file has been affected by incorrect reporting to the credit reference agencies by Steadypay.

What happened

I know that Mr B receives this decision in audio format. The previous audio disc sent to him was my provisional decision (“PD”) dated 13 January 2026. In that PD I gave reasons why I did not uphold the part of his complaint about irresponsible lending. I gave reasons why I planned to make a money award of £300 to Mr B for distress and inconvenience. I addressed Mr B’s concern about the reporting to the credit reference agencies.

To keep this final decision short, I have not repeated all of that PD here. The reasoning is the same. For expediency I refer both parties to that earlier document and audio disc.

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 PD, Mr B accepted the outcome on all points. Steadypay has written giving reasons why it disagrees with the £300 distress and inconvenience (D&I) compensation recommendation.

Steadypay has acknowledged that Mr B experienced distress. It has said:

“The evidence shows that distress escalated notwithstanding significant concessions, reduced contact, and prolonged pauses in collections activity.

Importantly:

- *No finding of harassment has been made;*
- *No finding of discrimination has been made;*
- *No financial loss has been identified;*
- *No credit detriment occurred; and*
- *The account was ultimately resolved in Mr B’s favour, with the offer to the remaining balance and the account be closed without default.”*

As I said in my PD, my role is not to make findings on harassment or discrimination. So, I don't consider that Steadypay's first two bullet points take the matter further forward. I could not make any findings on those points. I was considering compensation for D&I which Steadypay has accepted occurred.

Steadypay's response to my PD seems to be questioning the quantum rather than the principle of it.

Compensation consideration would not be linked with financial loss – so I don't see the relevance of Steadypay's third bullet point. Reference to the 'credit detriment' I think means reference to Mr B's credit record. In my PD I did not consider that Steadypay had got it wrong reporting what it has done to the credit reference agencies.

Mr B accepted my PD and therefore accepted my outcome on the lending. The offer Steadypay refers to in its last bullet point is a matter for Steadypay: it was, and still is not, part of my decision. As I had decided that the lending was not approved irresponsibly, I made no directions on any outstanding balance. Both parties need to resolve that between themselves. That is a totally different point to compensation for D&I.

I did not decide on a compensation figure for the consumer, here Mr B, intending it to be punitive to the lender. That is not our approach. So, I reject that line of argument from Steadypay.

Steadypay was incorrect continuing to use the CPA more than twice. Steadypay's response to my PD on that part gives no satisfactory explanation as to why it continued to apply it as many times as it did on 30 September 2024.

I've considered whether the relationship between Mr B and SteadyPay might have been unfair under section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974. However, I'm satisfied the redress I have directed should be carried out for Mr B results in fair compensation for him in the circumstances of his complaint. I'm satisfied, based on what I've seen, that no additional award would be appropriate in this case.

Putting things right

I have reviewed the evidence presented to me and how I came to the D&I sum of £300. I do not consider it disproportionate. I make a money award of £300. This is not to be set off against any outstanding balance. It needs to be paid directly to Mr B and to an account he nominates.

My final decision

For the reasons given in my PD, my final decision is I do not uphold the complaint on irresponsible lending.

For the reasons given in my PD, I make a money award for distress and inconvenience of £300, which I direct Steadypay Limited pays directly to Mr B within 28 days of him accepting the final decision – if he does.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr B to accept or reject my decision before 20 March 2026.

Rachael Williams
Ombudsman