

The complaint

Mr R complains that Gain Credit LLC trading as Lending Stream irresponsibly lent to him.

What happened

I issued a provisional decision on this complaint on 4 December 2025 where I set out a detailed background to this complaint. I don't intend to repeat the background here and my provisional decision forms part of this decision and should be read alongside it.

In my provisional decision I explained why I thought Lending Stream had done enough before agreeing to lend any of the four loans to Mr R. I gave both parties the opportunity to provide further evidence and comments. The time to respond has now passed and both parties have now responded to my provisional decision. Lending Stream said it had nothing further to add. Mr R expressed his disagreement with my provisional decision and provided copies of his bank statements, credit card statements and a notice of arrears.

In his response, Mr R says the investigator got the correct outcome. Mr R says he was indebted when Lending Stream provided him with the credit it did. Mr R also says I've chosen to ignore the findings from his complaint about another lender, and this is relevant as lending in that case was active at the time Lending Stream gave him credit.

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.

Having carefully reconsidered all the information in this case and Mr R's response to my provisional decision, I won't be upholding Mr R's complaint and will explain why below.

I already went into detail in my provisional decision about why I thought Lending Stream hadn't treated Mr R unfairly by lending any of the loans. So, I don't intend to repeat those details here.

I understand Mr R's disappointment with my provisional findings, but I want to assure him that I've thought carefully about all the information that has been provided in this case, including his bank statements and credit statements he provided before the investigator's view. By the nature of the work of the Financial Ombudsman Service, one party to a dispute will likely be disappointed.

As explained in my provisional decision, I didn't investigate Mr R's previous complaint about a different lender, so I don't know what that lender saw and what circumstances were considered. I also think it will be unfair to input what another lender knew about Mr R to Lending Stream's knowledge. Lending Stream's searched Mr R's credit file and it saw his credit commitments at the time.

I have to make a decision based on the facts of this *particular case*. Lending Stream carried out what I consider to be sufficient checks, and I explained why I thought this to be the case

in my provisional decision. Lending Stream for most of the loans, lent Mr R less than he requested, it increased the outgoings he declared. It searched his credit file and while there was some adverse information, as it was around eight months before the first loan, I don't think that should have resulted in an automatic rejection of Mr R's application as sufficient time had passed between that default and the lending decision.

Also, given the type of lending here, it isn't unusual for there to be some adverse information on credit files of consumers that take out these types of loans. I'd have expected Lending Stream to react to that information, and I think it did by increasing Mr R's credit commitments.

Lending Stream wasn't required to ask for bank statements or payslips, while that may be appropriate in some cases, and I don't think it needed to do so in this case. The fact that it hasn't done that here doesn't mean it didn't carry out borrower focussed checks. It relied on the information Mr R provided and reacted to the information its checks found.

This doesn't mean Mr R wasn't struggling financially, as I can see from his statements that he was repaying credit and appeared to be in arrears. The question I need to ask is based on what Lending Stream knew about Mr R or what it should reasonably have known in the circumstances, should it have been aware he'd struggle to keep up his loan repayments? I don't think Lending Stream's checks showed Mr R will struggle to make his repayments or that the results of those checks should have prompted further checks.

Ultimately, Lending Stream's reasonable checks showed Mr R was left with sufficient disposable income to repay each loan when it fell due. I'm also mindful Mr R didn't tell Lending Stream he was struggling so it didn't have that actual knowledge, and I don't think it ought reasonably to have been aware from its checks. Lending Stream reacted to the information it saw by increasing Mr R's outgoings, so overall I think it has done enough and hasn't lent to Mr R unfairly.

As previously stated, I understand that my findings will be disappointing for Mr R as I know this wasn't the outcome he'd hoped for, but I hope my explanation helps him understand why I've reached these conclusions.

Did Lending Stream act unfairly/unreasonably in some other way?

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

My final decision

For the reasons given here and in my provisional decision, I do not uphold Mr R's complaint or make any awards against Gain Credit LLC trading as Lending Stream

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr R to accept or reject my decision before 16 January 2026.

Oyetola Oduola
Ombudsman