

## **The complaint**

Mr V complains that Loans 2 Go Limited trading as Loans 2 Go (L2G) reported negative information to the credit reference agencies (CRA's) in relation to a loan repayment he made late.

## **What happened**

Mr V took out a loan with L2G in 2024. The loan repayment due date was set to the 29<sup>th</sup> of each month. Mr V set up a continuous payment authority to collect repayment on the last Tuesday of the month in line with when he got paid.

In August 2025, L2G attempted to collect Mr V's loan repayment on 26 August 2025, however its attempt to collect payment wasn't successful. L2G sent Mr V some text messages to let him know the payment hadn't been successful and to explain ways he could make the payment. Mr V then made payment on 3 September 2025.

Mr V says that he wasn't ever in a full months' worth of arrears, as he only made his repayment five days late. Therefore, he doesn't feel that it is fair or accurate of L2G to have reported that he had 'missed' a payment.

L2G didn't uphold Mr V's complaint. In summary, it explained that when it reported to the CRA's at the start of the month (September), Mr V's account was in arrears as no repayment had been received for August, and so it was accurate to have reported this to the CRA's.

An Investigator considered Mr V's complaint, but they didn't uphold it. In summary, they explained that L2G hadn't done anything wrong because Mr V hadn't made a payment by the payment due date, it wasn't unreasonable of L2G to have reported this to the CRA's.

Mr V didn't agree with the Investigator's view. He provided a detailed response; but in summary, he explained that it wasn't fair of L2G to have reported the information to the CRA's given that he had only been a few days late, and not a full month. He also explained that when he had been late in previous months, nothing had been recorded.

Because an agreement couldn't be reached, the complaint has been passed to me to decide on the matter.

## **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 considered all of the information available to me, I won't be upholding Mr V's complaint. I'll explain why below. But before I do that, it's worth noting here that I'm aware I have summarised Mr V's complaint and response to the Investigator's view in less detail than he has. I don't intend this as a discourtesy, but merely to reflect my informal role in reaching an outcome. This also means I haven't commented on everything Mr V has said, or all the evidence that has been provided. I have focused my findings on what I feel is relevant

to the crux of the complaint. However, I can assure Mr V that I have seen everything he has sent before reaching this outcome.

L2G has a responsibility to report accurate information to the CRA's. And where an account hasn't been managed in line with the terms of the agreement, for example, exceeding a credit limit, missing or making a payment late, this should be reported to the CRA's.

In this case then, Mr V's continuous payment authority attempted to collect on 26 August 2025 as per his instruction – as this was the last Tuesday in August. It wasn't successful, but Mr V still had until 29 August 2025 to make the payment in order for it to have been made in time under the terms of the agreement.

I can see L2G sent Mr V notification that the payment hadn't been successful on 26 August 2025, and explained how he could pay online. It sent another message to him on 27 August 2025, which, amongst other things provided Mr V with a link to make a payment – similar messages were also sent on 28 and 29 August 2025 and 3 September 2025. I'm satisfied L2G did enough to have made Mr V aware that his repayment was late and that he needed to take action.

No repayment was made by 29 August 2025 (it was made on 3 September 2025) and so, payment was late under the terms of the agreement. And in these circumstances, it isn't unfair or unreasonable of a firm to report that the account hadn't been managed in line with the terms and conditions.

L2G has said that it reports to the CRA's at the start of the month. And at the time of reporting, it hadn't received a payment from Mr V, and so it reported that a payment hadn't been made. This is fair and reasonable in the circumstances – it wouldn't have been correct for L2G to report that a payment had been received when it hadn't. And to say that a payment had been received in August 2025, wouldn't be correct reporting. As I've explained, L2G is required to report information that is accurate and reporting that a payment hadn't been made in line with the terms of the agreement is accurate in relation to what's happened here.

I note that Mr V says he has made payments late on other occasions, and this hasn't been reported to the CRA's. The reason previous occasions haven't been reported appears to be due to when L2G update the CRA, and that Mr V had brought the account back up to date by the time L2G had reported to the CRA's. But in my view, it wouldn't have been unreasonable of L2G to have reported the account hadn't been managed in line with the original terms on these previous occasions. I won't ask L2G to amend Mr V's credit file to reflect the other times he was late in making a payment, as this won't benefit him.

As I understand it, Mr V feels that it is unfair of L2G to report that a payment had been made late when it was only five days late and not a full calendar month. In this context 'late' would be a payment made anytime after the contractual and agreed repayment date. So I'm satisfied L2G hasn't acted unfairly here.

I can also see that Mr V feels that the by L2G sticking rigidly to the due date as set out in the loan agreement contradicts the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA's) principles of treating customers fairly. I'm sorry to disappoint Mr V but I don't agree. The agreement between Mr V and L2G was that he'd pay his monthly repayment by 29<sup>th</sup> of each month – both parties were aware of this because it is stated in the loan agreement. It wouldn't be reasonable for me to conclude that it was unfair of L2G to report that he had made a payment on time – because he hadn't. It follows that it would also be unreasonable for me to conclude that L2G had treated Mr V unfairly, in light of the FCA principles, or any other part of the rules as set out in the FCA's handbook.

**My final decision**

For the reasons set out above, I don't uphold Mr V's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr V to accept or reject my decision before 6 February 2026.

Sophie Wilkinson  
**Ombudsman**