

## **The complaint**

Lendable Ltd, trading as Zable, provided Mr B with a credit card in January 2024. It had a credit limit of £350. Mr B 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.

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 Mr B's case.

I've decided the credit was provided fairly for the following reasons:

- I think the checks Zable did before providing the credit were reasonable and proportionate, given the modest credit limit and what it knew about Mr B's financial situation.
- Zable considered information Mr B provided in his application, gathered information from a credit reference agency (CRA), and verified his income before agreeing to the credit card. To verify his income, they used Current Account Turnover data, which is information supplied by a CRA and is a calculation of customer income based on current account turnover, or in other words, the amounts going through a customer's bank account.
- These checks suggested Mr B had sufficient disposable income remaining after his essential spend and existing credit commitments. The CRA report also suggested Mr B was managing his accounts well, as there were no adverse markers reported.
- Based on the information Zable gathered and what it knew about Mr B's circumstances, there was nothing to suggest he would be unable to sustainably repay the credit, even if the full credit limit was utilised.
- Mr B has argued that his situation with debt was challenging, demonstrated by a high overdraft usage and other credit. The CRA information showed this totalled just over £10,000 at the point of applying for this credit card.

I've reviewed that information and completed my own affordability assessment. Having done so I am comfortable that, after verifying his income, Zable took a

reasonable approach for assessing his committed non-discretionary expenditure, using figures from Mr B's application where available, and reasonably calculated figures where they weren't.

- I don't think Zable acted unfairly in any other way.

This means I don't think Zable did anything wrong when it provided the credit card to Mr B.

I've also considered whether the relationship might have been unfair to Mr B under Section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974. However, for the reasons I've already explained, I don't think Zable lent irresponsibly to Mr B or otherwise treated him unfairly. I haven't seen anything to suggest that Section 140A or anything else would, given the facts of this complaint, lead to a different outcome here.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I'm not upholding Mr B's complaint about Lendable Ltd, trading as Zable, for the reasons explained above.

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

David Barker  
**Ombudsman**