

The complaint

Mr and Mrs E'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 E purchased membership of a timeshare (the 'Fractional Club') from a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') on 14 April 2014 (the 'Time of Sale'). They entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 2,750 fractional points at a cost of £37,361 (the 'Purchase Agreement'). But after trading in their existing timeshare, they ended up paying £9,850 for membership of the Fractional Club.

Fractional Club membership was asset backed – which meant it gave Mr and Mrs E 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 E paid for their Fractional Club membership by taking finance of £22,455 from the Lender in their joint names (the 'Credit Agreement'). This included additional borrowing to settle the loan they'd taken for their existing timeshare.

Mr and Mrs E – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender on 7 April 2020 (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 E say that the Supplier made pre-contractual misrepresentations at the Time of Sale – namely that the Supplier misrepresented the timeshare product and its benefits. No more detail about these allegations was provided in the Letter of Complaint.

Mr and Mrs E say that they have a claim against the Supplier in respect of one or both 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 E.

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 E 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. They were pressured into purchasing Fractional Club membership by the Supplier.
3. The decision to lend was irresponsible because the Lender didn't carry out the right creditworthiness assessment.
4. They were not advised of any commissions that may have been paid by the Lender to the Supplier for arranging the loan.

The Lender dealt with Mr and Mrs E's concerns as a complaint and issued its final response letter on 24 February 2021, rejecting it on every ground.

Mr and Mrs E had, by that time, 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 E'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 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

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

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 Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1999 (the 'UTCCR')

The UTCCR protected consumers against unfair standard terms in standard term contracts. They applied and apply to contracts entered into until and including 30 September 2015 when they were replaced by the Consumer Rights Act 2015.

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

- Regulation 5: Unfair Terms
- Regulation 6: Assessment of Unfair Terms
- Regulation 7: Written Contracts
- Schedule 2: Indicative and Non-Exhaustive List of Possible Unfair Terms

Relevant Publications

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').

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

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 E 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 two primary reasons that I set out at the start of this decision. They are that the Supplier misrepresented the 'timeshare product' and 'its benefits'. However, the PR hasn't explained what about these aspects that Mr and Mrs E believe were misrepresented. The allegation is very vague and lacking in any detail, which makes it difficult for me to find in their favour on these grounds in the circumstances.

While I recognise that Mr and Mrs E 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 E 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 E 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 E 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 E 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 E and the Lender.

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

Mr and Mrs E'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.

The PR says that the right checks weren't carried out before the Lender lent to Mr and Mrs E. 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 E 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 E.

Mr and Mrs E 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. I gather 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 E 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 E'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 E'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 E’s share in the Allocated Property clearly, in my view, 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 E 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 E, 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. There were, for instance, disclaimers in the contemporaneous paperwork that state that Fractional Club membership was not sold to Mr and Mrs E as an investment. So, it’s possible that Fractional Club membership wasn’t marketed or sold to them as an investment in breach of Regulation 14(3).

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 E 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 E 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 E 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 briefly mention that the Supplier led Mr and Mrs E to believe that the Fractional Club membership was an investment. But much more emphasis was placed on other alleged failings by the Supplier and/or the Lender. There was little indication that Mr and Mrs E were induced into the purchase on the grounds of investment.

The PR has provided two sets of written recollections. Both are unsigned and both claim to be from Mr E. Looking more closely at the first recollections, they were provided to this service together with a complaint form (and other documents) by the PR in September 2020. However, the complaint form wasn't signed by Mr and Mrs E and so they were asked to do so in March 2023. When the complaint form had been signed and returned, the first recollections weren't been attached to it as they had been before. The first recollections say:

'At a sales meeting... we were told what we owned was worthless and to upgrade to fractional owners. We would be guaranteed to get money back at the end of the contract amounting to a minimum of £40,000...

To get us free of these payments for the loan and for the interest we had to use my wife's retirement pension to pay it off. We paid for a product we couldn't use due to a lack of money and lack of availability. At Duchally we had to book 2 years in advance to get accommodation. When talking to others there people could book online at short notice and the luxury of not paying maintenance [sic] and at an affordable price. We were paying for other people to stay and we were paying for the upkeep of the place. It was not the exclusive place for members that we initially were told.'

In November 2023, the PR asked this service if we held a client statement. Our member of staff said we didn't and that's when it sent the second recollections. These were dated 23 August 2019 and discussed events dating back to 1999. The second recollections again included that Mr and Mrs E were told their previous purchases were worthless because they had to book holidays over a year in advance. Mr E said they were told at the Time of Sale that the fractional points were an investment as after 19 years they'd be bought back by the Supplier and provide 'a guaranteed substantial lump sum'.

Both sets of recollections are consistent in some regards but not in others. For example, allegations are made in both that the Fractional Club membership was sold as an investment. In both, Mr and Mrs E claim they were assured they would get money back. They put a specific number on the minimum they stood to get back in the first recollections – £40,000 – but not in the second. Mr and Mrs E mentioned that the Supplier would buy the points back from them in the second recollections but not the first.

I don't know why there are two sets of statements or how they came about. It's also difficult to know why there are differences between them. But I have concerns that Mr and Mrs E saw fit to specify the amount of return they were allegedly told they could expect in the first recollections but not in the second. That could, potentially, have been an important detail to include given the allegations they made and yet they omitted to mention it altogether from the statement this service received most recently.

Even if both statements referenced the amount, I'd need to consider how likely it is that Mr and Mrs E were led to believe they were guaranteed to get as much as £40,000 back from their initial outlay. Given the relatively small share in the Allocated Property they had purchased, I find that unlikely.

Overall, these anomalies cause me to question the plausibility and persuasiveness of both sets of recollections.

In terms of what else might have motivated Mr and Mrs E in deciding to proceed with the purchase, other than investing, I note that the purchase led to an increase in their points holding from 2,501 to 2,750. That represents a strengthening of their holiday booking power to some extent that would have enabled them to access a higher standard of accommodation, more holidays and bookings at higher-demand times. It's possible these features either individually or in combination were significant factors in their decision to go ahead with the purchase. That's especially the case since, in the Letter of Complaint, the PR says Mr and Mrs E 'were experiencing poor availability' and 'were required to book over a year in advance to obtain any holidays'. So it's conceivable that they saw Fractional Club membership as a solution to the problems they had faced.

That doesn't mean Mr and Mrs E weren'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 Mr and Mrs E themselves don't persuade me that their purchase was motivated by their 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 they ultimately made.

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 E'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 E 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

The PR says that Mr and Mrs E were not given sufficient information at the Time of Sale by the Supplier in order to make an informed choice.

It isn't clear what information the PR thinks the Supplier failed to provide at the Time of Sale. But 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.

So, while I acknowledge that it is also possible that the Supplier did not give Mr and Mrs E sufficient information, in good time, in order to satisfy the requirements of Regulation 12 of the Timeshare Regulations (which was concerned with the provision of 'key information'), even if that was the case, neither Mr and Mrs E nor the PR have persuaded me that they were deprived of information that would have led them to make a different purchasing decision at the Time of Sale. And with that being the case, even if there were information failings (which I make no formal finding on), I can't see why they led to a financial loss.

Mr and Mrs E's Commission Complaint

I note that one of Mr and Mrs E'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 E 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 E'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 E'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 E 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.

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 E, 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 E 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 Mr and Mrs E.

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 Mr and Mrs E entered into wasn't high. At £2,245.50, it was only 10% of the amount borrowed and even less than that (5%) as a proportion of the charge for credit. So, had they 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 they either wouldn't have understood that or would have otherwise questioned the size of the payment at that time. After all, Mr and Mrs E wanted Fractional Club membership and had no obvious means of their own to pay for it. And at such a low level, the impact of commission on the cost of the credit they needed for a timeshare they wanted doesn't strike me as disproportionate. So, I think they would still have taken out the loan to fund their 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 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 E 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.

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 Mr and Mrs E.

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 Mr and Mrs E and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement was unfair to them. 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 Mr and Mrs E's credit relationship with the Lender wasn't unfair to them 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 Mr and Mrs E'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 Mr and Mrs E (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 Mr and Mrs E 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 they would still have taken out the loan to fund their 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 Mr and Mrs E's Section 75 claim. I am also not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with them under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase 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.'

The Lender made no further comments regarding my PD or 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 E 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 E 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 Regulations

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 and Mrs E 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 E 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 E 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 E. It followed that I wasn't persuaded that the evidence suggested that Mr and Mrs E 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 E have had to say that they were persuaded to purchase due to reasons other than investment. For example, as a way of gaining access to better holidays and booking availability during higher-demand times. 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 E'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 and Mrs E have 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 E has 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 E'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 E'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 E 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 E'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 Mr E and Mrs E to accept or reject my decision before 8 January 2026.

Nimish Patel
Ombudsman