

Complaint

Mr E has complained about a credit card Zopa Bank Limited (“Zopa”) provided to him.

He says that he shouldn’t have been given the credit card and that it was irresponsibly provided to him.

Background

In August 2024, Zopa provided Mr E with a credit card which had a limit of £1,200.00. Mr E wasn’t provided with any credit limit increases.

One of our investigators reviewed what Mr E and Zopa had told us. And she thought Zopa hadn’t done anything wrong or treated Mr E unfairly in relation to providing the credit card.

So she didn’t recommend that Mr E’s complaint be upheld. Mr E disagreed and asked for an ombudsman to look at the complaint.

My findings

I’ve considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what’s fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

Having carefully considered everything, I’ve decided not to uphold Mr E’s complaint. I’ll explain why in a little more detail.

We’ve explained how we handle complaints about unaffordable and irresponsible lending on our website. And I’ve used this approach to help me decide Mr E’s complaint.

Zopa needed to make sure it didn’t lend irresponsibly. In practice, what this means is Zopa needed to carry out proportionate checks to be able to understand whether Mr E could afford to repay any credit it provided.

Our website sets out what we typically think about when deciding whether a lender’s checks were proportionate. Generally, we don’t think that it is necessarily unreasonable for a lender’s checks to be less detailed – in terms of how much information it gathers and what it does to verify it – in the early stages of a lending relationship.

But we might think it needed to do more if, for example, a borrower’s income was low or the amount lent was high. And the longer the lending relationship goes on, the greater the risk of it becoming unsustainable and the borrower experiencing financial difficulty. So we’d expect a lender to be able to show that it didn’t continue to lend to a customer irresponsibly.

Zopa says it agreed to Mr E’s application after it obtained information on his income and carried out a credit search. And the information obtained indicated that Mr E would be able to make the relatively low monthly repayment required to clear the balance that could be owed within a reasonable period of time. On the other hand, Mr E says that he shouldn’t have been lent to under any circumstances.

I've considered what the parties have said.

What's important to note is that Mr E was provided with a revolving credit facility rather than a loan. And this means that Zopa was required to understand whether a credit limit of £1,200.00 could be repaid within a reasonable period of time, rather than in one go. A credit limit of £1,200.00 required relatively low monthly payments in order to clear the full amount that could be owed within a reasonable period of time.

I've seen the information Zopa obtained from Mr E about his income and what was on the credit search carried out. Zopa says that Mr E declared a salary of £45,000.00 a year and that he had mortgage payments of £500 a month. I've seen that Zopa's credit search showed that Mr E had defaulted accounts recorded against him. The last of these had occurred in the year prior to this application.

Given how long it had been since Mr E's defaults occurred, I don't think that these defaulted accounts in themselves meant that Mr E shouldn't have been lent to. In my view, Zopa was reasonably entitled to place more weight on the active credit that Mr E had, which on the whole appeared to be managed reasonably well. This is especially as Zopa had taken steps to cross check Mr E's declaration of income against information from credit reference agencies which indicated his declaration was plausible.

For the sake of completeness, I would also add that it's also not even immediately apparent to me that even more checks, which at the absolute maximum would have consisted of finding out more about Mr E's living expenses rather than relying on estimates of this, would, in any event, have led to Zopa making a different decision.

I say this because I've not seen anything which clearly demonstrates that Mr E's monthly committed living costs were substantially higher than the combination of declared information and statistical data which Zopa used. Equally, there is nothing else that has been provided to me which shows me that had Zopa obtained these actual living costs, it would more likely than not have learned that the relatively low monthly payments that could be due on this card were more likely than not unaffordable.

I accept that Mr E's actual circumstances may not have been reflected either in the information he provided, or the other information Zopa obtained. For example, Mr E has said that he had taken payday loans and was borrowing from friends and family. However, the only payday loan that showed in Zopa's credit search was taken in 2020. In any event, Mr E taking out a payday loan wouldn't in itself mean that he shouldn't have been lent to.

Furthermore, Zopa's credit search wouldn't have highlighted any borrowing from friends and family either. So I don't think that Zopa could reasonably be expected to have known about this. As this is the case, I can't reasonably say that Mr E perhaps borrowing from friends and family meant that he shouldn't have been provided with this credit card either.

In reaching my conclusions, I've also considered whether the lending relationship between Zopa and Mr E might have been unfair to Mr E under s140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 ("CCA").

However, for the reasons I've explained, I've not been persuaded that Zopa irresponsibly lent to Mr E or otherwise treated him unfairly in relation to this matter. And I haven't seen anything to suggest that s140A CCA or anything else would, given the facts of this complaint, lead to a different outcome here.

So overall and having considered everything I don't think that Zopa treated Mr E unfairly or

unreasonably in approving his credit card application. I appreciate this will be very disappointing for Mr E. But I hope he'll understand the reasons for my decision and that he'll at least feel his concerns have been listened to.

My final decision

For the reasons I've explained, I'm not upholding Mr E's complaint.

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

Jeshen Narayanan
Ombudsman