

The complaint

Mr and Mrs P'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 them under Section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 (as amended) (the 'CCA') and (2) deciding against paying a claim under Section 75 of the CCA.

What happened

Mr and Mrs P purchased membership of a timeshare (the 'Fractional Club') from a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') on 7 July 2016 (the 'Time of Sale'). They traded in their existing 2,988 timeshare points and entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 3,260 fractional points at a cost of £6,586 (the 'Purchase Agreement').

Fractional Club membership was asset backed – which meant it gave Mr and Mrs P more than just holiday rights. It also included a share in the net sale proceeds of a property named on their Purchase Agreement (the 'Allocated Property') after their membership term ends.

Mr and Mrs P paid for their Fractional Club membership by taking finance of £6,586 from the Lender in their joint names (the 'Credit Agreement').

Mr and Mrs P – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender on 2 July 2021 (the 'Letter of Complaint') to complain about:

1. Misrepresentations by the Supplier at the Time of Sale giving them a claim against the Lender under Section 75 of the CCA, which the Lender failed to accept and pay.
2. The Lender being party to an unfair credit relationship under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA.
3. The decision to lend being irresponsible because the Lender did not carry out the right creditworthiness assessment.
4. The non-disclosure of any commission paid by the Lender to the Supplier for arranging the loan.

Section 75 of the CCA: the Supplier's misrepresentations at the Time of Sale

Mr and Mrs P say that the Supplier made a number of pre-contractual misrepresentations at the Time of Sale – namely that the Supplier:

1. told them that Fractional Club membership had a guaranteed end date when that was not true since there was no guaranteed date of sale.
2. told them they were making an investment when that was not true.
3. told them that they were buying a share in property when that was not true.

Mr and Mrs P say that they have a claim against the Supplier in respect of one or more of the misrepresentations set out above, and therefore, under Section 75 of the CCA, they have a like claim against the Lender, who, with the Supplier, is jointly and severally liable to Mr and Mrs P.

Section 140A of the CCA: the Lender's participation in an unfair credit relationship

The Letter of Complaint set out several reasons why Mr and Mrs P say that the credit relationship between them and the Lender was unfair to them under Section 140A of the CCA. In summary, they include the following:

1. Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to them as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare, Holiday Products, Resale and Exchange Contracts Regulations 2010 (the 'Timeshare Regulations').
2. The contractual terms setting out (i) the duration of their Fractional Club membership and/or (ii) the obligation to pay annual management charges for the duration of their membership were unfair contract terms under the Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1999 (the 'UTCCR').
3. They were pressured into purchasing Fractional Club membership by the Supplier.
4. The Supplier's sales presentation at the Time of Sale included misleading actions and/or misleading omissions under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 (the 'CPUT Regulations') as well as a prohibited practice under Schedule 1 of those Regulations.
5. The decision to lend was irresponsible because the Lender didn't carry out the right creditworthiness assessment.

The Lender dealt with Mr and Mrs P's concerns as a complaint and issued its final response letter on 16 August 2021, rejecting it on every ground.

Mr and Mrs P then referred the complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service. It was assessed by an Investigator who, having considered the information on file, upheld the complaint on its merits.

The Lender disagreed with the Investigator's assessment and asked for an Ombudsman's decision – which is why it was passed to me.

After initially confirming Mr and Mrs P's acceptance of the Investigator's assessment, the PR later requested that at least £3,000 in compensation be paid to them in addition to the redress previously recommended. It said this was for the distress and inconvenience the Lender had caused them in not reaching a fair and reasonable outcome to their complaint (and to others the PR represented).

I considered the matter and issued a provisional decision (the 'PD'). In that decision, I said:

'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 as follows:

The Consumer Credit Act 1974 (as amended by the Consumer Credit Act 2006) (the 'CCA')

The timeshare at the centre of the complaint in question was/were paid for using restricted-use credit that was regulated by the Consumer Credit Act 1974. As a result, the purchase was covered by certain protections afforded to consumers by the CCA provided the necessary conditions were and are met. The most relevant sections as at the relevant time are below.

Section 56: Antecedent Negotiations

Section 75: Liability of Creditor for Breaches by a Supplier

Sections 140A: Unfair Relationships Between Creditors and Debtors

Section 140B: Powers of Court in Relation to Unfair Relationships

Section 140C: Interpretation of Sections 140A and 140B

Case Law on Section 140A

Of particular relevance to the complaint in question are:

- 1. The Supreme Court's judgment in Plevin v Paragon Personal Finance Ltd [2014] UKSC 61 ('Plevin') remains the leading case.*
- 2. The judgment of the Court of Appeal in the case of Scotland v British Credit Trust [2014] EWCA Civ 790 ('Scotland and Reast') sets out a helpful interpretation of the deemed agency and unfair relationship provisions of the CCA.*
- 3. Patel v Patel [2009] EWHC 3264 (QB) ('Patel') – in which the High Court held that determining whether or not the relationship complained of was unfair had to be made "having regard to the entirety of the relationship and all potentially relevant matters up to the time of making the determination", which was the date of the trial in the case of an existing relationship or otherwise the date the relationship ended.*
- 4. The Supreme Court's judgment in Smith v Royal Bank of Scotland Plc [2023] UKSC 34 ('Smith') – which approved the High Court's judgment in Patel.*
- 5. Deutsche Bank (Suisse) SA v Khan and others [2013] EWHC 482 (Comm) – in Hamblen J summarised – at paragraph 346 – some of the general principles that apply to the application of the unfair relationship test.*
- 6. Carney v NM Rothschild & Sons Ltd [2018] EWHC 958 ('Carney').*
- 7. Kerrigan v Elevate Credit International Ltd [2020] EWHC 2169 (Comm) ('Kerrigan').*
- 8. 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').*

My Understanding of the Law on the Unfair Relationship Provisions

Under Section 140A of the CCA, a debtor-creditor relationship can be found to have been or be unfair to the debtor because of one or more of the following: the terms of the credit agreement itself; how the creditor exercised or enforced its rights under the agreement; and any other thing done (or not done) by, or on behalf of, the creditor (either before or after the making of the agreement or any related agreement) (s.140A(1) CCA). Such a finding may also be based on the terms of any related agreement (which here, includes the Purchase Agreement) and, when combined with Section 56 of the CCA, on anything done or not done by the supplier on the creditor's behalf before the making of the credit agreement or any related agreement.

Section 56 plays an important role in the CCA because it defines the terms "antecedent negotiations" and "negotiator". As a result, it provides a foundation for a number of provisions that follow it. But it also creates a statutory agency in particular circumstances. And while Section 56(1) sets out three of them, the most relevant to this complaint are negotiations conducted by the supplier in relation to a transaction financed or proposed to be financed by a debtor-creditor-supplier agreement.

A debtor-creditor-supplier agreement is defined by Section 12(b) of the CCA as "a restricted-use credit agreement which falls within section 11(1)(b) and is made by the creditor under pre-existing arrangements, or in contemplation of future arrangements, between himself and

the supplier [...]". And Section 11(1)(b) of the CCA says that a restricted-use credit agreement is a regulated credit agreement used to "finance a transaction between the debtor and a person (the 'supplier') other than the creditor [...]" and "restricted-use credit" shall be construed accordingly."

So, the negotiations conducted by the Supplier during the sale of the timeshare(s) in question was/were conducted in relation to a transaction financed or proposed to be financed by a debtor-creditor-supplier agreement as defined by Section 12(b). That made them antecedent negotiations under Section 56(1)(c) – which, in turn, meant that they were conducted by the Supplier as an agent for the Lender as per Section 56(2). And such antecedent negotiations were "any other thing done (or not done) by, or on behalf of, the creditor" under s.140A(1)(c) CCA.

Antecedent negotiations under Section 56 cover both the acts and omissions of the Supplier, as Lord Sumption made clear in Plevin, at paragraph 31:

"[Section] 56 provides that [when] antecedent negotiations for a debtor-creditor-supplier agreement are conducted by a credit-broker or the supplier, the negotiations are "deemed to be conducted by the negotiator in the capacity of agent of the creditor as well as in his actual capacity". The result is that the debtor's statutory rights of withdrawal from prospective agreements, cancellation and rescission may arise on account of the conduct of the negotiator whether or not he was the creditor's agent.' [...] Sections 56 and 140A(3) provide for a deemed agency, even in a case where there is no actual one. [...] These provisions are there because without them the creditor's responsibility would be engaged only by its own acts or omissions or those of its agents."

And this was recognised by Mrs Justice Collins Rice in Shawbrook & BPF v FOS at paragraph 135:

"By virtue of the deemed agency provision of s.56, therefore, acts or omissions 'by or on behalf of' the bank within s.140A(1)(c) may include acts or omissions of the timeshare company in 'antecedent negotiations' with the consumer".

In the case of Scotland & Reast, the Court of Appeal said, at paragraph 56, that the effect of Section 56(2) of the CCA meant that "negotiations are deemed to have been conducted by the negotiator as agent for the creditor, and that is so irrespective of what the position would have been at common law" before going on to say the following in paragraph 74:

"[...] there is nothing in the wording of s.56(2) to suggest any legislative intent to limit its application so as to exclude s.140A. Moreover, the words in s.140A(1)(c) "any other thing done (or not done) by, or on behalf of, the creditor" are entirely apposite to include antecedent negotiations falling within the scope of s.56(1)(c) and which are deemed by s.56(2) to have been conducted by the supplier as agent of the creditor. Indeed the purpose of s.56(2) is to render the creditor responsible for such statements made by the negotiator and so it seems to me wholly consistent with the scheme of the Act that, where appropriate, they should be taken into account in assessing whether the relationship between the creditor and the debtor is unfair."¹

So, the Supplier is deemed to be Lender's statutory agent for the purpose of the pre-contractual negotiations.

However, an assessment of unfairness under Section 140A isn't limited to what happened immediately before or at the time a credit agreement and related agreement were entered

¹ The Court of Appeal's decision in *Scotland* was recently followed in *Smith*.

into. The High Court held in *Patel* (which was recently approved by the Supreme Court in the case of *Smith*), that determining whether or not the relationship complained of was unfair had to be made “having regard to the entirety of the relationship and all potentially relevant matters up to the time of making the determination” – which was the date of the trial in the case of an existing credit relationship or otherwise the date the credit relationship ended.

The breadth of the unfair relationship test under Section 140A, therefore, is stark. But it isn’t a right afforded to a debtor simply because of a breach of a legal or equitable duty. As the Supreme Court said in *Plevin* (at paragraph 17):

“Section 140A [...] does not impose any obligation and is not concerned with the question whether the creditor or anyone else is in breach of a duty. It is concerned with [...] whether the creditor’s relationship with the debtor was unfair.”

Instead, it was said by the Supreme Court in *Plevin* that the protection afforded to debtors by Section 140A is the consequence of all of the relevant facts.

The Law on Misrepresentation

The law relating to misrepresentation is a combination of the common law, equity and statute – though, as I understand it, the Misrepresentation Act 1967 didn’t alter the rules as to what constitutes an effective misrepresentation. It isn’t practical to cover the law on misrepresentation in full in this decision – nor is it necessary. But, summarising the relevant pages in *Chitty on Contracts* (33rd Edition), a material and actionable misrepresentation is an untrue statement of existing fact or law made by one party (or his agent for the purposes of passing on the representation, acting within the scope of his authority) to another party that induced that party to enter into a contract.

The misrepresentation doesn’t need to be the only matter that induced the representee to enter into the contract. But the representee must have been materially influenced by the misrepresentation and (unless the misrepresentation was fraudulent or was known to be likely to influence the person to whom it was made) the misrepresentation must be such that it would affect the judgement of a reasonable person when deciding whether to enter into the contract and on what terms.

However, a mere statement of opinion, rather than fact or law, which proves to be unfounded, isn’t a misrepresentation unless the opinion amounts to a statement of fact and it can be proved that the person who gave it, did not hold it, or could not reasonably have held it. It also needs to be shown that the other party understood and relied on the implied factual misrepresentation.

Silence, subject to some exceptions, doesn’t usually amount to a misrepresentation on its own as there is generally no duty to disclose facts which, if known, would affect a party’s decision to enter a contract. And the courts aren’t too ready to find an implied representation given the challenges acknowledged throughout case law.

The Timeshare, Holiday Products, Resale and Exchange Contracts Regulations 2010 (the ‘Timeshare Regulations’)

The relevant rules and regulations that the Supplier in this complaint had to follow were set out in the Timeshare Regulations. I’m not deciding – nor is it my role to decide – whether the Supplier (which isn’t a respondent to this complaint) is liable for any breaches of these Regulations. But they are relevant to this complaint insofar as they inform and influence the extent to which the relationship in question was unfair. After all, they signal the standard of

commercial conduct reasonably expected of the Supplier when acting as the creditor's agent in marketing and selling membership of the Owners Club.

The Regulations have been amended in places since the Time of Sale. So, I refer below to the most relevant regulations as they were at the time in question:

- *Regulation 12: Key Information*
- *Regulation 13: Completing the Standard Information Form*
- *Regulation 14: Marketing and Sales*
- *Regulation 15: Form of Contract*
- *Regulation 16: Obligations of Trader*

The Timeshare Regulations were introduced to implement EC legislation, Directive 122/EC on the protection of consumers in respect of certain aspects of timeshare, long-term holiday products, resale and exchange contracts (the '2008 Timeshare Directive'), with the purpose of achieving 'a high level of consumer protection' (Article 1 of the 2008 Timeshare Directive). The EC had deemed the 2008 Timeshare Directive necessary because the nature of timeshare products and the commercial practices that had grown up around their sale made it appropriate to pass specific and detailed legislation, going further than the existing and more general unfair trading practices legislation.²

The Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 (the 'CPUT Regulations')

The CPUT Regulations put in place a regulatory framework to prevent business practices that were and are unfair to consumers. They have been amended in places since they were first introduced. And it's only since 1 October 2014 that they imposed civil liability for certain breaches – though not misleading omissions. But, again, I'm not deciding – nor is it my role to decide – whether the Supplier is liable for any breaches of these regulations. Instead, they are relevant to this complaint insofar as they inform and influence the extent to which the relationship in question was unfair as they also signal the standard of commercial conduct reasonably expected of the Supplier when acting as the creditor's agent in marketing and selling membership of the Owners Club.

Below are the most relevant regulations as they were at the relevant time:

- *Regulation 3: Prohibition of Unfair Commercial Practices*
- *Regulation 5: Misleading Actions*
- *Regulation 6: Misleading Omissions*
- *Regulation 7: Aggressive Commercial Practices*
- *Schedule 1: Paragraphs 7 and 24*

The Consumer Rights Act 2015 (the 'CRA')

The CRA, amongst other things, protects consumers against unfair terms in contracts. It applies to contracts entered into on or after 1 October 2015 – replacing the Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1999.

Part 2 of the CRA is the most relevant section as at the relevant time.

Relevant Publications

² See Recital 9 in the Preamble to the 2008 Timeshare Directive.

The Timeshare Regulations provided a regulatory framework. But as the parties to this complaint already know, I am also required to take into account, when appropriate, what I consider to have been good industry practice at the relevant time – which, in this complaint, includes the Resort Development Organisation’s Code of Conduct dated 1 January 2010 (the ‘RDO Code’).

What I’ve provisionally 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.

And having done that, I do not currently think this complaint should be upheld.

But 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

As both sides may already know, a claim against the Lender under Section 75 essentially mirrors the claim Mr and Mrs P could make against the Supplier. Certain conditions must be met if this protection is engaged – which are set out in the CCA. The Lender does not dispute that the relevant conditions are met in this complaint and I’m satisfied that they are.

This part of the complaint was made for several reasons that I set out at the start of this decision. They include the suggestion that Fractional Club membership had been misrepresented by the Supplier because Mr and Mrs P were told that they were buying an interest in a specific piece of property when that was not true. However, telling prospective members that they were buying a fraction or share of one of the Supplier’s properties was not untrue. Mr and Mrs P’s share in the 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 them that interest, it did not change the fact that they acquired such an interest.

Mr and Mrs P also say the sale date was not guaranteed and that they had no right to force a sale. They said these rights were instead held by the trustee. However, that wasn’t the case, with the property to be sold and the proceeds of the sale shared after the agreed number of years. The sale could only be postponed by up to two years in limited circumstances and by unanimous agreement. So, without more detail about precisely what was said, I am not persuaded that the general representation alluded to constituted a false statement of fact even if it was made.

The PR said the Supplier sold the Fractional Club membership to Mr and Mrs P as an investment when it wasn’t an investment. However, Mr and Mrs P’s share in the Allocated Property, in my view, did constitute an investment as it offered them the prospect of a financial return – whether or not, like all investments, that was more than what they first put into it. So again, if this statement was made, it wouldn’t be untrue.

While I recognise that Mr and Mrs P have concerns about the way in which their Fractional Club membership was sold, they have not persuaded me that there was an actionable misrepresentation by the Supplier at the Time of Sale for the reasons they allege or for any other reason.

For these reasons, therefore, I do not think the Lender is liable to pay Mr and Mrs P any

compensation for the alleged misrepresentations of the Supplier. And with that being the case, I do not think the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with the Section 75 claim in question.

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

I have already explained why I am not persuaded that the contract entered into by Mr and Mrs P was misrepresented (or breached) by the Supplier in a way that makes for a successful claim under Section 75 of the CCA and outcome in this complaint. But Mr and Mrs P also say that the credit relationship between them and the Lender was unfair under Section 140A of the CCA, when looking at all the circumstances of the case, including parts of the Supplier's sales process at the Time of Sale that they have concerns about. It is those concerns that I explore here.

I have considered the entirety of the credit relationship between Mr and Mrs P and the Lender along with all of the circumstances of the complaint and I do not 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;
4. The inherent probabilities of the sale given its circumstances; and, when relevant
5. Any existing unfairness from a related credit agreement.

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

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

Mr and Mrs P's complaint about the Lender being party to an unfair credit relationship was also made for several reasons, all of which I set out at the start of this decision.

They include the allegation that the Supplier misled Mr and Mrs P and carried on unfair commercial practices which were prohibited under the CPUT Regulations. However, as Regulations 5 and 6 state, commercial practices only amount to misleading actions or omissions if, in addition to satisfying one or more of the specific matters set out in those provisions, they cause or are likely to cause the average consumer to take a transactional decision they would not have taken otherwise. And as I haven't seen enough evidence to persuade me that, if there were Page 8 of 13 any such actions or omissions at the Time of Sale (which I make no formal finding on), they led Mr and Mrs P to make the purchasing decision they did, I'm not persuaded that anything done or not done by the Supplier amounted to an unfair commercial practice for the purposes of those provisions.

The PR says that the right checks weren't carried out before the Lender lent to Mr and Mrs P. I haven't seen anything to persuade me that was the case in this complaint given its 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 Mr and Mrs P was actually unaffordable before also concluding that they lost out as a result and then consider whether the credit relationship with the Lender was

unfair to them for this reason. Again, from the information provided, I am not satisfied that the lending was unaffordable for the Mr and Mrs P.

Mr and Mrs P say that they were pressured by the Supplier into purchasing Fractional Club membership at the Time of Sale. I acknowledge that they may have felt weary after a sales process that went on for a long time. But they say little about what was said and/or done by the Supplier during their sales presentation that made them feel as if they had no choice but to purchase Fractional Club membership when they simply did not want to. They were also given a 14-day cooling off period and they have not provided a credible explanation for why they did not cancel their membership during that time. And with all of that being the case, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that Mr and Mrs P made the decision to purchase Fractional Club membership because their ability to exercise that choice was significantly impaired by pressure from the Supplier.

I'm not persuaded, therefore, that Mr and Mrs P's credit relationship with the Lender was rendered unfair to them under Section 140A for any of the reasons above. But there is another reason, perhaps the main reason, why they say their credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to them. And that's the suggestion that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to them as an investment in breach of prohibition against selling timeshares in that way.

Was Fractional Club membership marketed and sold at the Time of Sale as an investment in breach of regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations?

The Lender does not dispute, and I am satisfied, that Mr and Mrs P's Fractional Club 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 membership of the Fractional Club 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 says that the Supplier did exactly that at the Time of Sale. So, that is what I have considered next.

The term "investment" is not defined in the Timeshare Regulations. In Shawbrook & BPF v FOS, the parties agreed that, 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" at [56]. I will use the same definition.

Mr and Mrs P's share in the Allocated Property clearly, in my view and as explained above, constituted an investment as it offered them the prospect of a financial return – whether or not, like all investments, that was more than what they first put into it. But the fact that Fractional Club 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.

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

To conclude, therefore, that Fractional Club membership was marketed or sold to Mr and Mrs P 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 them as an investment, i.e. told them or led them to believe that Fractional Club membership offered them 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 Fractional Club 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 Fractional Club as an 'investment' or quantifying to prospective purchasers, such as Mr and Mrs P, 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 training material left open the possibility that the sales representative may have positioned Fractional Club membership as an investment. So, I accept that it's equally possible that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to Mr and Mrs P 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 is 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 Mr and Mrs P rendered unfair to them?

As the Supreme Court's judgment in Plevin makes clear, it does not automatically follow that regulatory breaches create unfairness for the purposes of Section 140A. Such breaches and their consequences (if there are any) must be considered in the round, rather than in a narrow or technical way.

And in light of what the courts had to say in Carney and Kerrigan, it seems to me that, if I am to conclude that a breach of Regulation 14(3) led to a credit relationship between Mr and Mrs P and the Lender that was unfair to them 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.

The PR's Letter of Complaint did mention that the Supplier led Mr and Mrs P to believe that the Fractional Club membership was an investment from which they would make a financial gain. But more emphasis was placed on other alleged failings by the Supplier and/or the Lender. There was little indication that Mr and Mrs P were induced into the purchase on the grounds of investment.

The PR has provided a copy Client Statement it says was made by Mr P, although it is unsigned. While the statement is dated 15 January 2020, it was not sent to this service until October 2023. So, it is possible that it was influenced in some way by the outcome of the judicial review earlier in 2023 where it was held that a breach of Regulation 14(3) could lead to an unfair debtor-creditor relationship. I am also unsure as to why there was such a significant delay from the time the statement was made to when the Letter of Complaint was sent to the Lender around 18 months later.

Looking past all these issues and focussing instead on the contents of the statement, I am not persuaded that they would lead me to uphold the complaint in any case. I say that because, in the statement, Mr P describes the events at the Time of Sale in very similar terms as those used to describe a timeshare sale that took place more than four years prior. It may be that Mr P's experiences of the sales were very similar, but the comments provide little insight into the relevant events.

In addition, some of the recollections are not completely accurate and are somewhat contradictory. I'm mindful that errors can easily occur when trying to recall events that took place several years prior, and this is understandable. But, in this case, the anomalies cause me to question the plausibility and persuasiveness of the stated recollections.

For instance, Mr P says one of the features of their previous timeshare was that it was sold as providing a guaranteed exit from their existing agreement after nine years. Mr P says the same about the Fractional Club membership complained about here – that it was sold as guaranteeing their exit after nine years. However, if one of their aims was to exit their timeshare quickly as is suggested, I fail to see how this would have been achieved by trading in the timeshare they bought in 2012 and entering into a further agreement that provided a later end date than the agreement they were already in. And I gather that the contractual sale date of the Allocated Property is, in fact, 2031 – meaning the contract length is 15 years and not 9.

In terms of what else might have motivated Mr and Mrs P in deciding to proceed with the purchase other than investing, I note that the purchase led to an increase in their points holding from 2,988 to 3,260. That represents a strengthening of their booking power to some extent. And I gather the purchase meant they no longer had to pay booking fees. Given that Mr and Mrs P's booking history shows they have booked several holidays since the Time of Sale it's possible these factors either individually or in combination were the main factors in their decision to go ahead with the purchase.

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

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

It is clear from the submissions of everyone involved in this complaint that there was a lot of information passed between the Supplier and Mr and Mrs P when they purchased membership of the Fractional Club at the Time of Sale.

The PR says that the contractual terms governing the ongoing costs of Fractional Club membership and the consequences of not meeting those costs were unfair contract terms under the UTCCR. I would emphasise that, because the contract was entered into after 1 October 2015, the CRA applies in this case rather than the UTCCR.

Irrespective of that, one of the main aims of the Timeshare Regulations and the CRA was to enable consumers to understand the financial implications of their purchase so that they were/are put in the position to make an informed decision. And if a supplier's disclosure and/or the terms of a contract did not recognise and reflect that aim, and the consumer ultimately lost out or almost certainly stands to lose out from having entered into a contract

whose financial implications they didn't fully understand at the time of contracting, that may lead to the Timeshare Regulations and the CRA being breached, and, potentially the credit agreement being found to be unfair under Section 140A of the CCA.

However, as I've said before, the Supreme Court made it clear in Plevin that it does not automatically follow that regulatory breaches create unfairness for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA. The extent to which such mistakes render a credit relationship unfair must also be determined according to their impact on the complainant.

It is possible that some of the terms governing the Fractional Club go against the requirements of the CRA. But given the particular circumstances of this complaint, even if some of the terms in question did constitute unfair contract terms under the CRA, it seems unlikely to me that they led to any actual unfairness in the credit relationship between Mr and Mrs P and the Lender for the purposes of Section 140A. I say this because I cannot see that the potentially offending terms were operated against Mr and Mrs P during the time that they were party to the Credit Agreement – nor can I see that there were any ongoing effects of unfairness because of the terms in question. And with that being the case, I cannot see that the potential unfairness of those terms eventuated in practice.

Mr and Mrs P's Commission Complaint

*I note that one of Mr and Mrs P's other concerns relates to alleged payments of commission by the Lender to the Supplier for acting as a credit broker and arranging the Credit Agreement. The Supreme Court's recent judgment *Johnson v FirstRand Bank Ltd, Wrench v FirstRand Bank Ltd and Hopcraft v Close Brothers Ltd* [2025] UKSC 33 ('Johnson, Wrench and Hopcraft') clarified the law on payments of commission – albeit in the context of car dealers acting as credit brokers. In my view, the Supreme Court's judgment sets out principles which appear capable of applying to credit brokers other than car dealer–credit brokers. At present, I do not know enough about the relevant arrangements in place at the Time of Sale. So, once I know more, I will finalise my findings on this complaint.*

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, and if I put the issue of commission to one side for the time being, I am not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with Mr and Mrs P under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to them for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA – nor do I see any other reason why it would be fair or reasonable to direct the Lender to compensate them.

*But, as I've already said, it is necessary to wait for information on the relevant arrangements (considered in *Johnson, Wrench and Hopcraft*) between the Lender and Supplier before finalising my thoughts on the merits of this complaint.'*

I then sent the parties my thoughts on Mr and Mrs P's commission complaint and provided them with the opportunity to respond. My thoughts included the following:

'In my provisional decision, I noted that one of Mr and Mrs P's other concerns related to the alleged payment of commission by the Lender to the Supplier for acting as a credit broker and arranging the Credit Agreement. But, I said that the Supreme Court's pending (at that time) judgment on this issue may prove important to this complaint. So, I explained that I wouldn't finalise my thoughts on this complaint until it had been handed down and I'd considered its implications on this complaint, if there are any.

As that has now happened and I've considered it, I'm outlining my thoughts on this issue in this letter so that both parties have the opportunity to respond before I finalise my decision.

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.

In my provisional decision, I explained that the legal and regulatory context that I think is relevant to this complaint is, in many ways, no different to that shared in several hundred published ombudsman decisions on very similar complaints – which can be found on the Financial Ombudsman Service's website. And I said that with that being the case, it is not necessary to set out that context in detail 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

The Provision of Information by the Supplier at the Time of Sale

The PR says 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 Mr and Mrs P in arguing that their credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to them for reasons relating to commission given the facts and circumstances of this complaint.

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 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 Mr and Mrs P but as the supplier of contractual rights they 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 them when arranging the Credit Agreement and thus a fiduciary duty.

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 Mr and Mrs P, 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 Mr and Mrs P into a credit agreement that cost disproportionately more than it otherwise could have.

What's more, in stark contrast to the facts of Mr Johnson's case, as I understand it, no payment between the Lender and the Supplier, such as a commission, was payable when the Credit Agreement was arranged at the Time of Sale. And with that being the case, even if there were information failings at that time and regulatory failings as a result (which I make no formal finding on), I'm not currently persuaded that the commercial 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 Mr and Mrs P.'

The Lender accepted the PD and made no further comments regarding my findings on commission.

The PR accepted my findings regarding commission but not on other aspects of the complaint. It provided some further comments and evidence it wished to be considered.

Having received the relevant responses from both parties, 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.

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

As outlined in my PD, 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 PD. 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 PD. So, I'll focus here on the PR's points raised in response.

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

The Supplier's alleged breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare regulation

Included in the PR's response to my PD was an oral hearing request along with the offer to produce sworn affidavits. Oral hearings are something that I can direct be held under DISP 3.5.5. However, the Financial Ombudsman Service is set up to decide complaints informally and it is for me as the decision maker to determine what evidence I think I need to determine what is a fair and reasonable outcome to a complaint. Having considered everything, I do not think I need to hold an oral hearing to fairly determine this complaint.

This is because both parties have already provided lengthy submissions. In this case, we have a statement from Mr P and other evidence, including the documents from the sale, and full submissions from PR and Lender to decide what I think was most likely to have

happened. I'm satisfied I'm able to weigh up what Mr and Mrs P have said against the available evidence and arguments to determine what I think happened on the balance of probabilities without the need for an oral hearing. And as it's in everyone's interest to resolve this complaint as soon as possible, to grant a hearing at such a late stage would inevitably prolong the resolution of this case.

I understand that the PR also offers to have Mr and Mrs P provide a sworn affidavit. But I must remind them that we don't have strict evidential requirements. We aren't expected to decide complaints only after receiving sworn evidence. And our jurisdiction is investigative rather than adversarial. I remain of the view that the information we have on file is enough to cover all the issues I need to consider to reach a fair decision. And as I've considered everything on file, including the specific points raised by the PR as part of its request, I'm of the view that a hearing request and/or sworn affidavits aren't required.

As I explained in my PD, although I found there was a possibility that the Supplier breached Regulation 14(3) at the Time of Sale, I wasn't persuaded that this was a motivating factor for Mr and Mrs P. It followed that I wasn't persuaded that the evidence suggested that Mr and Mrs P purchased Fractional Club membership in whole or in part down to any breach of Regulation 14(3).

And as I already said in my PD, it seems from what Mr and Mrs P have had to say that they were persuaded to purchase due to reasons other than investment. For example, as a way of exiting their existing timeshare sooner. They also mentioned being pressured – although I've already explained in my PD why I wasn't persuaded by that particular point.

Here, the PR has stated that I've been inconsistent with my approach compared to previous decisions issued by ombudsmen at this service, and has provided examples it feels demonstrates this. But my decision is based on consideration of Mr and Mrs P's specific circumstances. Each complaint turns on its own facts; an ombudsman's decision on how one timeshare sale occurred does not determine his, or any other ombudsman's, decisions about the facts of other sales at different times to different purchases.

The PR has also reiterated that the judgment handed down in *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS* asserted that the relevant question in this circumstance is whether the breach of Regulation 14(3) was a material factor in the decision to purchase, not whether it was the only factor or principal one. It feels that the testimony Mr P has provided demonstrates that this was the case. But, as I explained in my provisional decision, I'm not persuaded from the testimony that Mr and Mrs P have adequately demonstrated that the promise of profit was a motivating factor to their decision to move ahead with the purchase – principal or otherwise.

So, ultimately, for the above reasons, along with those I already explained in my PD, I remain unpersuaded that any breach of Regulation 14(3) was material to Mr and Mrs P's purchasing decision.

So, as I said before, even if the Supplier had marketed or sold the membership as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3) (which I still make no finding on here), I'm not persuaded Mr and Mrs P's decision to make the purchase was motivated by the prospect of a financial gain. So, I still don't think the credit relationship between Mr and Mrs P and the Lender was unfair to them for this reason.

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 Mr and Mrs P's Section 75 claim, and I am not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with them under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to them 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 them.

My final decision

For these reasons, my final decision is that I do not uphold the complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs P and Mr P to accept or reject my decision before 7 January 2026.

Nimish Patel
Ombudsman