

## The complaint

Mrs L's complaint is, in essence, that Shawbrook Bank Limited (the 'Lender') acted unfairly and unreasonably by (1) being party to an unfair credit relationship with her under Section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 (as amended) (the 'CCA') and (2) deciding against paying claims under Section 75 of the CCA.

## What happened

Mrs L was the member of a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') – having purchased a timeshare product from it in the past. But the product at the centre of this complaint is her membership of a timeshare that I'll call the 'Signature Collection' which she purchased on 2 January 2018 (the 'Time of Sale'). She entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 1,500 fractional points at a cost of £12,734 (the 'Purchase Agreement').

Signature Collection membership was asset backed – which meant it gave Mrs L 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 their membership term ends.

Mrs L paid for her Signature Collection membership by taking finance of £28,279 from the Lender (the 'Credit Agreement'). Of this amount £15,545 repaid a loan (also with the Lender) that was used to pay for an existing timeshare Mrs L had purchased from the Supplier.

Mrs L – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender in June 2020 (the 'Letter of Complaint') to raise a number of different concerns. Since then the PR has raised some further matters it says are relevant to the outcome of the complaint. As both sides are familiar with the concerns raised, it isn't necessary to repeat them in detail here beyond the summary above.

The Lender dealt with Mrs L's concerns as a complaint and issued its final response letter on 21 April 2021, rejecting it on every ground. Mrs L then referred her complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service.

I issued a provisional decision explaining why I didn't plan to uphold Mrs L's complaint. I said:

*"I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint. And having done that, I do not currently 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.*

*Certain conditions must be met if the protection afforded to consumers is engaged, including, for instance, the cash price of the purchase and the nature of the arrangements between the parties involved in the transaction. The Lender doesn’t dispute that the relevant conditions are met. But for reasons I’ll come on to below, it isn’t necessary to make any formal findings on them here.*

*It was said in the Letter of Complaint that Signature Collection membership had been misrepresented by the Supplier at the Time of Sale because Mrs L was:*

- 1. told by the Supplier that Signature Collection membership had a guaranteed end date when that was not true.*
- 2. Told by the Supplier that she owned a ‘fraction’ of the Allocated Property when that was not true as it was owned by a trustee.*
- 3. told by the Supplier that Signature Collection membership was an “investment” when that was not true.*

*Neither the PR nor Mrs L have set out in any detail what words and/or phrases were allegedly used by the Supplier to misrepresent Signature Collection for the reason given in points 1 or 2. However, the PR says that such representations were untrue because the Allocated Property was legally owned by a trustee and there was no indication of what duty of care it had to actively market and sell the property. Further, there is no guarantee that any sale will result at all, leaving prospective members to pay their annual management charge for an indefinite and unspecified period.*

*However, I cannot see why the phrases in points 1 or 2 above would have been untrue at the Time of Sale even if it was said. It seems to me to reflect the main thrust of the contract Mrs L entered into. And while, under the relevant Signature Collection Rules, the sale of the Allocated Property could be postponed for up to two years by the ‘Vendor’<sup>1</sup>, longer than that if there were problems selling and the ‘Owners’<sup>2</sup> agreed, or for an otherwise specified period provided there was unanimous agreement in writing from the Owners, that does not render the representation above untrue. So, I am not persuaded that the representation above constituted a false statement of fact even if it was made.*

*As for point 3, it does not strike me as a misrepresentation even if such a representation 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 – nor was it untrue to tell prospective members that they would receive some money when the allocated property is sold. After all, a share in an allocated property was clearly the purchase of a share of the net sale proceeds of a specific property in a specific resort. And while the PR might question the exact legal mechanism used to give prospective members that interest, it did not change the fact that they acquired such an interest.*

*The PR has raised other matters as potential misrepresentations, but it seems to me that they are not allegations of the Supplier saying something that was untrue. Rather, it is that Mrs L wasn’t told things about the way the membership worked, for example, was that the obligation to pay management fees could be passed on to their children. It seems to me that*

these are allegations that Mrs L wasn't given all the information they needed at the Time of Sale, and I will deal with this further below.

So, while I recognise that Mrs L - and the PR - have concerns about the way in which Signature Collection membership was sold by the Supplier, when looking at the claim under Section 75 of the CCA, I can only consider whether there was a factual and material misrepresentation by the Supplier. For the reasons I've set out above, I'm not persuaded that there was. And that means that I don't think that the Lender acted unreasonably or unfairly when it dealt with this particular Section 75 claim.

### **Section 75 of the CCA: the Supplier's Breach of Contract**

---

I have already summarised how Section 75 of the CCA works and why it gives consumers a right of recourse against a lender. So, it is not necessary to repeat that here other than to say that, if I find that the Supplier is liable for having breached the Purchase Agreement, the Lender is also liable.

Mrs L said that she could not holiday where and when she wanted to. That was framed, in the Letter of Complaint, as an alleged misrepresentation. However, on my reading of the complaint, this suggests that the Supplier was not living up to its end of the bargain, potentially breaching the Purchase Agreement.

Yet, like any holiday accommodation, availability was not unlimited. Some of the sales paperwork likely to have been signed by Mrs L states that the availability of holidays was/is subject to demand. I accept that she may not have been able to take certain holidays. But I have not seen enough to persuade me that the Supplier had breached the terms of the Purchase Agreement.

So, from the evidence I have seen, I do not think the Lender is liable to pay Mrs L any compensation for a breach of contract by the Supplier. And with that being the case, I do not think the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably in relation to this aspect of the complaint either.

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

---

I've already explained why I'm not persuaded that Signature Collection membership was actionably misrepresented by the Supplier at the Time of Sale. But there are other aspects of the sales process that, being the subject of dissatisfaction, I must explore with Section 140A in mind if I'm to consider this complaint in full – which is what I've done next.

Having considered the entirety of the credit relationship between Mrs L and the Lender along with all of the circumstances of the complaint, I don't 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, including the contractual documentation and disclaimers made by the Supplier;
3. Evidence provided by both parties on what was likely to have been said and/or done at the Time of Sale; and
4. The inherent probabilities of the sale given its circumstances.
5. Any existing unfairness from a related credit agreement, noting however that no

*complaint has been referred to this service about any previous agreement.*

*I have then considered the impact of these on the fairness of the credit relationship between Mrs L and the Lender.*

### **The Supplier's sales & marketing practices at the Time of Sale**

*Mrs L's complaint about the Lender being party to an unfair credit relationship was and is made for several reasons.*

*They include, allegations that:*

- 1. Mrs L was pressured by the Supplier into purchasing Signature Collection membership at the Time of Sale.*
- 2. The right checks weren't carried out before the Lender lent to Mrs L.*
- 3. The loan interest was excessive.*
- 4. Mrs L was not given a choice of lender by the Supplier.*
- 5. The Credit Agreement was arranged by a broker acting outside of its authorisation.*

*However, as things currently stand, none of these strike me as reasons why this complaint should succeed.*

*I acknowledge that Mrs L may have felt weary after a sales process that went on for a long time. But she has said little about what was said and/or done by the Supplier during their sales presentation that made them feel as if she had no choice but to purchase Signature Collection membership when she simply did not want to. She was also given a 14-day cooling off period and she has not provided a credible explanation for why she did not cancel her membership during that time. And with all of that being the case, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that Mrs L made the decision to purchase Signature Collection membership because her ability to exercise that choice was significantly impaired by pressure from the Supplier.*

*I haven't seen anything to persuade me that the right checks weren't carried out by the Lender given this complaint's 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 Mrs L was actually unaffordable before also concluding that she lost out as a result and then consider whether the credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to her for this reason. But from the information provided, I am not satisfied that the lending was unaffordable for the Mrs L.*

*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 wasn't permitted to enforce the Credit Agreement. However, it looks to me like Mrs L knew, amongst other things, how much she was borrowing and repaying each month, who she was borrowing from and that she was borrowing money to pay for Signature Collection membership. And as the lending doesn't look like it was unaffordable for her, even if the Credit Agreement was arranged by a broker that didn't have the necessary permission to do so (which I make no formal finding on), I can't see why that led to Mrs L suffering a financial loss – such that I can say that the credit relationship in question was unfair on her as a result. And with that being the case, I'm not persuaded that it would be fair or reasonable to tell the Lender to compensate Mrs L, even if the loan wasn't arranged properly.*

Similarly, the PR has not explained how, if it were true, Mrs L not being offered a different lender to pay for Signature Collection membership caused her any unfairness or financial loss. Mrs L was aware of the interest rate set out on the face of the Credit Agreement, as well as the term of the loan and the monthly repayments, so they understood what it was they were taking out. Further, I don't think the rate of interest was excessive, compared either to other rates available from other point-of-sale lenders or on the open market, so I can't say it would be fair or reasonable to tell the Lender to do anything because of this.

Overall, therefore, I don't think that Mrs L credit relationship with the Lender was rendered unfair to her under Section 140A for any of the reasons above. But there is another reason, perhaps the main reason, why the PR now says the credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to her. And that's the suggestion that Signature Collection membership was marketed and sold to Mrs L 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 Mrs L's Signature Collection 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 Signature Collection 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 and Mrs L say that the Supplier did exactly that at the Time of Sale – saying, in summary, that they were told by the Supplier that Signature Collection 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 Mrs L the prospect of a financial return – whether or not, like all investments, that was more than what they first put into it. But it is important to note at this stage that the fact that Signature Collection 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 doesn't 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.<sup>3</sup>

In other words, the Timeshare Regulations did not ban products such as the Signature Collection. They just regulated how such products were marketed and sold.

To conclude, therefore, that Signature Collection membership was marketed or sold to Mrs L 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 her as an investment, i.e. told her or led her to believe that Signature Collection membership offered her 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 Signature Collection 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 Signature Collection as an 'investment' or quantifying to prospective purchasers, such as Mrs L, 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 Signature Collection membership as an investment. So, I accept that it's equally possible that Signature Collection membership was marketed and sold to Mrs L 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's not necessary to make a formal finding on that particular issue for the purposes of this decision.*

#### ***Was the credit relationship between the Lender and the Consumer rendered unfair?***

*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 Mrs L 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 Mrs L and the Lender that was unfair to her and warranted relief as a result, whether the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) led them 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 Signature Collection membership was not an important and motivating factor when Mrs L decided to go ahead with her purchase. The testimony that has been provided does not persuade me of this as it has not been consistent. For example, a statement of truth <sup>1</sup>that was provided to this service on 9 September 2020 and dated 25 June 2020 in respect of Mrs L's complaint makes no reference to Signature Collection having been marketed to Mrs L as an investment. Indeed the focus of Mrs L's dissatisfaction in this letter appears to relate exclusively to the availability of accommodation.*

*The PR has also provided copies of emails Mrs L's partner sent to the Supplier in September 2019 and March 2020 in which they express dissatisfaction with their membership. Again the focus of the complaints is the availability of accommodation. While I accept this doesn't mean of itself that Mrs L couldn't have been motivated to purchase Signature Collection membership by the prospect of a profit or financial gain at the Time of Sale, I think it makes it more likely that Mrs L had other motivations for the purchase. Indeed within the email sent in September 2020 Mrs L's partner says "the whole purpose of acquiring the holiday*

---

<sup>1</sup> References to a statement of truth are in fact references to a written statement provided by the PR

membership was to keep us in the lifestyle we've become accustomed to and increase the quality of our holidays and save us money".

I recognise that the PR has provided what it said were call notes taken when it spoke with Mrs L's partner in January 2020 and that within these notes it says "false promises, instead of saving money and make some profit at the end of the contract, it's ended up costing us money". This could perhaps suggest that the prospect of making a profit was a motivating factor for Mrs L when making her purchase.

I note however that these notes were provided in May 2025, long after the statement of truth and emails that were sent in 2019 and 2020 and after the investigator sent their assessment and after the judge's decision in the case of 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'). I don't think the (albeit brief) mention of an expectation of a profit in the call notes carries much weight in this particular case as it does not appear to be reflected in any of the subsequent testimony that was provided in 2020 nor in the complaint correspondence that was issued shortly after the call notes were said to have been taken.

That doesn't mean Mrs L wasn't interested in a share in the Allocated Property. After all, that wouldn't be surprising given the nature of the product at the centre of this complaint. But as Mrs L doesn't persuade me that her purchase was motivated by her share in the Allocated Property and the possibility of a profit, I don't think a breach of Regulation 14(3) by the Supplier was likely to have been material to the decision she ultimately made.

On balance, therefore, even if the Supplier had marketed or sold the Signature Collection membership as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations, I am not persuaded that Mrs L's decision to purchase Signature Collection 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 she would have pressed ahead with her 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 Mrs L and the Lender was unfair to Mrs L even if the Supplier had breached Regulation 14(3).

### **The provision of information by the Supplier at the Time of Sale**

The PR says that Mrs L was not given sufficient information at the Time of Sale by the Supplier about membership, including about the ongoing costs of Signature Collection membership and the fact that Mrs L's heirs could inherit these costs.

As I've already indicated, the case law on Section 140A makes it clear that it does not automatically follow that regulatory breaches create unfairness for the purposes of the unfair relationship provisions. The extent to which such mistakes render a credit relationship unfair must also be determined according to their impact on the complainant.

I acknowledge that it is also possible that the Supplier did not give Mrs L sufficient information, in good time, on the various charges she could have been subject to as Signature Collection members in order to satisfy the requirements of Regulation 12 of the Timeshare Regulations (which was concerned with the provision of 'key information'). But even if that was the case, I cannot see that the ongoing costs of membership were applied unfairly in practice. And as neither Mrs L nor the PR have persuaded me that they would not have pressed ahead with their purchase had the finer details of the Signature Collection's ongoing costs been disclosed by the Supplier in compliance with Regulation 12, I cannot see

*why any failings in that regard are likely to be material to the outcome of this complaint given its fact and circumstances.*

*As for the PR's argument that Mrs L's heirs would inherit the on-going management charges, I fail to see how that could be the case or that it could have led to an unfairness that warrants a remedy.*

## **Conclusion**

---

*In conclusion, as things currently stand, I do not think that the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with the relevant Section 75 claim(s) and I am not persuaded that the Lender was party to credit relationships with Mrs L under the Credit Agreements that were unfair to them for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA – nor do I see no other reason why it would be fair or reasonable to direct the Lender to compensate them.”*

The Lender accepted my provisional decision.

The PR did not accept it and provided further comments and evidence it wished for me to consider.

I then contacted the parties to set out my thoughts on Mrs L's concerns about the alleged payment of commission by the Lender to the Supplier for acting as a credit broker and arranging the Credit Agreement. I said:

*“The PR suggested 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.*

*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 Mrs L in arguing that her credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to her 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 Mrs L, 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 Mrs L 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 Mrs L.*

*In stark contrast to the facts of Mr Johnson's case, the amount of commission paid by the Lender to the Supplier for arranging the Credit Agreement that Mrs L entered into wasn't high. At £1,413.95, it was only 5% of the amount borrowed and even less than that (4.63%) as a proportion of the charge for credit. So, had she 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 she either wouldn't have understood that or would have otherwise questioned the size of the payment at that time. After all, Mrs L wanted Fractional Club<sup>2\*</sup> membership and had no obvious means of her own to pay for it. And at such a low level, the impact of commission on the cost of the credit she needed for a timeshare she wanted doesn't strike me as disproportionate. So, I think she would still have taken out the loan to fund 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*

---

<sup>2</sup> \*references to Fractional Club membership should be read as references to Signature Collection membership

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 Mrs L but as the supplier of contractual rights she 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 her 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 Mrs L.

So, given all of the factors I've looked at both here and in my provisional decision, and having taken all of them into account, I'm still not persuaded that the credit relationship between Mrs L and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement was unfair to her. 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 provisionally found that Mrs L's credit relationship with the Lender wasn't unfair to her 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 Mrs L'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 Mrs L (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 Mrs L 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 her. 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 she would still have taken out the loan to fund her purchase at the Time of Sale had there been more adequate disclosure of the commission arrangements that applied at that time.

So again, in conclusion, given the facts and circumstances of this complaint, I still do not think that the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with Mrs L's Section 75 claim. I am also not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with her under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement that was unfair to her 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 her.

As outlined in my covering email, the deadline for both parties to provide any further comments or evidence they would like me to consider is 18 December 2025. I will then finalise my decision."

The PR accepted my findings on this point.

Having received the relevant responses, 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.

### **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 no different to that shared in several hundred ombudsman decisions on very similar complaints. And with that being the case, it is not necessary to set it out here. But, following my provisional decision, 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

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 my provisional decision in the main relate to the issue of whether the credit relationship between Mrs L and the Lender was unfair. In particular, the PR has provided further comments in relation to whether the membership was sold to Mrs L as an investment at the Time of Sale.

As outlined in my provisional decision the PR originally raised various other points of complaint, all of which I addressed at that time. But they didn't make any further comments

in relation to those in their response to my provisional decision. Indeed, they haven't said they disagree 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 provisional decision. So, I'll focus here on the PR's points raised in response.

Some of the comments and evidence the PR provided relate to whether Signature Collection membership was marketed as an investment in breach of the prohibition in Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations. However, as I explained in my provisional decision, while the Supplier's sales processes left open the possibility that the sales representative may have positioned Signature Collection membership as an investment, it isn't necessary 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 comments and evidence in this respect do not persuade me that I should uphold Mrs L's complaint because they do not make me think it's any more likely that the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) led Mrs L to enter into the Purchase Agreement and the Credit Agreement.

The PR has also provided its further thoughts as to Mrs L's likely motivations for purchasing Signature Collection membership. I recognise it has interpreted Mrs L's testimony differently to how I have and thinks it points to her having been motivated by the prospect of a financial gain from Signature Collection membership.

In my provisional decision I explained the reasons why I didn't think Mrs L's purchase was motivated by the prospect of a financial gain (i.e., a profit). And although I have carefully considered the PR's arguments in response to this, I'm not persuaded the conclusion I reached on this point was unfair or unreasonable.

The PR said the comments in my provisional decision relating to the call notes it said it took in January 2020 suggest that because they were provided in 2025 this casts doubt on the accuracy or credibility of them. For clarity, I accept the notes were taken in this case when the PR said they were.

I recognise these notes do make mention of Signature Collection membership costing money *"instead of saving money and making some profit at the end of the contract"*. However, they make no reference to what was said or done by the Supplier to make Mrs L think she could receive a profit from Signature Collection membership. And in any event, I still think it's reasonable to take Mrs L's written statement as her finalised version of her testimony. And nothing within this statement makes me think the prospect of a financial gain or profit were important factors in her decision to purchase Signature Collection membership. I still think it's reasonable to conclude that if such prospect had been that important to her, this would have been apparent from her written statement. But it's not, and from looking at that statement and from looking at the subsequent communications with the Supplier, I think the quality and availability of accommodation were most likely the important factors in Mrs L's decision to purchase Signature Collection membership.

So, ultimately, for the above reasons, along with those I already explained in my provisional decision, I remain unpersuaded that any breach of Regulation 14(3) was material to Mrs L's purchasing decision. And for that reason, I do not think the credit relationship between Mrs L and the Lender was unfair to her even if the Supplier had breached Regulation 14(3).

#### **S140A conclusion**

Given all of the factors I've looked at in this part of my decision, including the relevant relationships, arrangements and payments between the Lender and the Supplier and having taken all of them into account, I'm not persuaded that the credit relationship between Mrs L and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement was unfair to her. So, I don't think it is fair or reasonable that I uphold this complaint on that basis.

## **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 Mrs L's Section 75 claims, and I am not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with her under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to her 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 her.

## **My final decision**

For the reasons I have explained, I do not uphold Mrs L's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs L to accept or reject my decision before 6 January 2026.

Michael Ball  
**Ombudsman**