

## **The complaint**

Mr and Mrs D's complaint is, in essence, that First Holiday Finance Ltd (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.

## **Background to the complaint**

Mr and Mrs D were members of a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') – having purchased a number of products from it over time. But the product at the centre of this complaint is their membership of a timeshare that I'll call the 'Fractional Club' – which they bought on 7 August 2013 (the 'Time of Sale'). They entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 1,600 fractional points which, after trading in their existing membership, cost £21,704 (the 'Purchase Agreement').

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

Mr and Mrs D paid for their Fractional Club membership by making an advance payment of £500 and taking finance of £21,204 from the Lender (the 'Credit Agreement').

Mr and Mrs D – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender on 30 August 2022 (the 'Letter of Complaint') to raise a number of different concerns. As those concerns haven't changed since they were first raised, and as both sides are familiar with them, it isn't necessary to repeat them in detail here beyond the summary above.

The Lender dealt with Mr and Mrs D's concerns as a complaint and issued its final response letter on 6 September 2022, rejecting it on every ground.

The complaint was then referred to the Financial Ombudsman Service. It was assessed by an Investigator who, having considered the information on file, rejected the complaint on its merits.

Mr and Mrs D disagreed with the Investigator's assessment and asked for an Ombudsman's decision. So the complaint was passed to me to decide.

I considered the matter, and I also thought this complaint ought not to be upheld. But as my reasons were more extensive than those given by our Investigator, I issued a provisional decision (the 'PD'), and I invited both parties to respond before issuing a final decision.

The PR responded stating it did not accept the PD, and it provided some further comments it wished to be considered. The Lender confirmed it accepted the PD and had nothing further to add.

In light of the parties' responses to the PD, I'm now finalising my decision on this complaint.

### **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 the complaint afresh, I still do not think it should be upheld. However, 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's to decide what's 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.

### **The legal and regulatory context**

In considering what's fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of the complaint, I'm required under DISP 3.6.4 R 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, 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 with that being the case, it's not necessary to set out that context in detail here. But I would add that the following regulatory rules/guidance are also relevant:

#### The Office of Fair Trading's Irresponsible Lending Guidance – 31 March 2010

The primary purpose of this guidance was to provide greater clarity for businesses and consumer representatives as to the business practices that the Office of Fair Trading (the 'OFT') thought might have constituted irresponsible lending for the purposes of Section 25(2B) of the CCA. Below are the most relevant paragraphs as they were at the relevant time:

- Paragraph 2.2
- Paragraph 2.3
- Paragraph 5.5

#### The OFT's Guidance for Credit Brokers and Intermediaries - 24 November 2011

The primary purpose of this guidance was to provide clarity for credit brokers and credit intermediaries as to the standards expected of them by the OFT when they dealt with actual or prospective borrowers. Below are the most relevant paragraphs as they were at the relevant time:

- Paragraph 2.2

- Paragraph 3.7
- Paragraph 4.8

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

---

The CCA introduced a regime of connected lender liability under Section 75 that affords consumers ("debtors") a right of recourse against lenders that provide the finance for the acquisition of goods or services from third-party merchants ("suppliers"), in the event that there is an actionable misrepresentation and/or breach of contract by the supplier.

Certain conditions must be met if the protection afforded to consumers is engaged, including, for instance, the cash price of the purchase and the nature of the arrangements between the parties involved in the transaction. The Lender doesn't dispute that the relevant conditions are met. But for reasons I'll come on to below, it isn't necessary to make any formal findings on them here.

In general, lenders can reasonably reject Section 75 claims that they are first informed about after the claim has become time-barred under the Limitation Act 1980 (the "LA") as it wouldn't be fair to expect creditors to look into such claims so long after the liability arose, and after a limitation defence would have been available in court. So, it's relevant to consider if Mr and Mrs D's Section 75 claim was time-barred under the LA before it was put to the Lender.

A claim for misrepresentation against the Supplier would ordinarily be made under Section 2(1) of the Misrepresentation Act 1967. And the limitation period to make such a claim expires six years from the date on which the cause of action accrued. Any claim against a lender under Section 75 is also "*an action to recover any sum by virtue of any enactment*" under Section 9 of the LA. Such claims also have a time limit of six years from the date the cause of action accrued.

In claims for misrepresentation, the cause of action accrues at the point a loss is incurred. In Mr and Mrs D's case, that was at the Time of Sale because they entered into the agreement to purchase fractional club membership, and the related Credit Agreement to finance the purchase, based on the alleged misrepresentations of the Supplier which they say they relied on.

Mr and Mrs D first notified the Lender of their Section 75 claim on 30 August 2022. As that was more than six years after the Time of Sale, I don't think it was unfair or unreasonable of the Lender to reject their claim relating to the Supplier's alleged misrepresentations.

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

---

I've already explained why I don't think the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably by rejecting Mr and Mrs D's Section 75 claim relating to the Supplier's alleged misrepresentations. But I must explore these alleged misrepresentations, along with other aspects of the sales process that are the subject of dissatisfaction, with Section 140A in mind if I'm to consider this complaint in full – which is what I've done next.

Having considered the entirety of the credit relationship between Mr and Mrs D and the Lender along with all of the circumstances of the complaint, I don't 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 commission arrangements between the Lender and the Supplier at the Time of Sale and the disclosure of those arrangements;
5. The inherent probabilities of the sale given its circumstances; and, when relevant
6. 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 D and the Lender.

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

Mr and Mrs D's complaint about the Lender being party to an unfair credit relationship was made for several reasons.

The PR says that Fractional Club membership was misrepresented by the Supplier at the Time of Sale because Mr and Mrs D were:

1. Told that they had purchased an investment that would "*considerably appreciate in value.*"
2. Promised a considerable return on their investment because they were told that they would own a share in a property that would considerably increase in value.
3. Told that they could sell their Fractional Club membership to the Supplier or easily to third parties at a profit.
4. Made to believe that they would have access to "*the holiday apartment*" at any time all year round.

However, neither points 1 nor 2 strike me as misrepresentations even if such representations had been made by the Supplier (which I make no formal finding on). Telling prospective members that they were investing their money because they were buying a fraction or share of one of the Supplier's properties was not untrue. And even if the Supplier's sales representatives went further and suggested that the share in question would increase in value, perhaps considerably so, that sounds like nothing more than an honestly held opinion as there isn't any accompanying evidence to persuade me that the relevant sales representative(s) said something that, while an opinion, amounted to a statement of fact that they did not hold or could not have reasonably held.

As for points 3 and 4, while it's *possible* that Fractional Club membership was misrepresented at the Time of Sale for one or both of those reasons, I don't think it's *probable*. They're given little to none of the colour or context necessary to demonstrating that the Supplier made false statements of existing fact and/or opinion. And as there isn't any other evidence on file to support the suggestion that Fractional Club membership was misrepresented for these reasons, I don't think it was.

The PR also says that the right checks weren't carried out before the Lender lent to Mr and Mrs D. 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 D 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. But from the information provided, I'm not satisfied that the lending was unaffordable for Mr and Mrs D.

Connected to this is the suggestion by the PR that the Credit Agreement was arranged by an unauthorised credit broker, the upshot of which is to suggest that the Lender wasn't permitted to enforce the Credit Agreement. However, it looks to me like Mr and Mrs D knew, amongst other things, how much they were borrowing and repaying each month, who they were borrowing from and that they were borrowing money to pay for Fractional Club membership. And as the lending doesn't look like it was unaffordable for them, even if the Credit Agreement was arranged by a broker that didn't have the necessary permission to do so (which I make no formal finding on), I can't see why that led to Mr and Mrs D experiencing a financial loss – such that I can say that the credit relationship in question was unfair on them as a result. And with that being the case, I'm not persuaded that it would be fair or reasonable to tell the Lender to compensate them, even if the loan wasn't arranged properly.

Another reason the PR has given is that there were one or more unfair contract terms in the Purchase Agreement. But as I can't see that any such terms were operated unfairly against Mr and Mrs D in practice, nor that any such terms led them to behave in a certain way to their detriment, I'm not persuaded that any of the terms governing Fractional Club membership are likely to have led to an unfairness that warrants a remedy.

I acknowledge that Mr and Mrs D 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 D made the decision to purchase Fractional Club membership because their ability to exercise that choice was significantly impaired by pressure from the Supplier.

Overall, therefore, I don't think that Mr and Mrs D'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 the PR says the 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 the prohibition against selling timeshares in that way.

### **The Supplier's alleged breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations**

The Lender does not dispute, and I'm satisfied, that Mr and Mrs D'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 Fractional Club membership 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 – saying, in summary, that Mr and Mrs D were told by the Supplier that Fractional Club membership was the type of investment that would only increase in value.

The term "investment" is not defined in the Timeshare Regulations. But for the purposes of this provisional decision, and 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.

A share in the Allocated Property clearly constituted an investment as it offered Mr and Mrs D the prospect of a financial return – whether or not, like all investments, that was more than what they first put into it. But it is important to note at this stage that 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 D 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's 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 D, 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 the Supplier's sales process left open the possibility that the sales representative(s) may have positioned Fractional Club membership as an investment. So, I accept it's also possible that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to Mr and Mrs D 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's not necessary to make a formal finding on that particular issue for the purposes of this decision.

**Would the credit relationship between the Lender and Mr and Mrs D have been rendered unfair to them had there been a breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations?**

Having found it was possible that the Supplier breached Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations at the Time of Sale, I now need to consider what impact that breach had on the fairness of the credit relationship between Mr and Mrs D and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement, as 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.

Indeed, it seems to me that, if I'm to conclude that a breach of Regulation 14(3) led to a credit relationship between Mr and Mrs D 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.

In my PD I explained that on my reading of the evidence before me, the prospect of a financial gain from Fractional Club membership was not an important and motivating factor when Mr and Mrs D decided to go ahead with their purchase. That didn't mean they weren't interested in a share in the Allocated Property. After all, that would not have been surprising given the nature of the product at the centre of this complaint. But as Mr and Mrs D themselves did not persuade me that their purchase was motivated by their share in the Allocated Property and the possibility of a profit, I did not think a breach of Regulation 14(3) by the Supplier was likely to have been material to the decision they ultimately made.

I said this because I could not give Mr and Mrs D's testimony the weight necessary to finding the credit relationship in question was unfair to them due to a breach of Regulation 14(3). That's because Mr and Mrs D's testimony was only provided to us after the Investigator issued their view and after the judgment in *Shawbrook and BPF v FOS*<sup>1</sup> was handed down, and the other evidence before me did not corroborate Mr and Mrs D's testimony.

---

<sup>1</sup> *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*').

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 was not persuaded that Mr and Mrs D'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 thought the evidence suggested they would have proceeded with their purchase whether or not there had been a breach of Regulation 14(3). And for that reason, I did not think the credit relationship between Mr and Mrs D and the Lender was unfair to them even if the Supplier had breached Regulation 14(3).

### **The PR's response to my PD**

The PR explained in its response to my PD that it hadn't shared the Investigator's view on this complaint with Mr and Mrs D, saying "*this was a deliberate step to ensure that their recollections remained entirely their own and were not influenced by external documents.*"

The PR also said that even if Mr and Mrs D had come across any information about the judgement handed down in *Shawbrook and BPF v FOS*, they would not have understood it because of the complexity of the issues and as they do not have a legal background.

Part of my assessment of Mr and Mrs D's testimony was to consider *when* it was written, and whether it may have been affected by external factors such as the widespread publication of the outcome of *Shawbrook and BPF v FOS*.

I have thought about what the PR has said, but on balance, I don't find it a credible explanation for the contents of Mr and Mrs D's evidence. Here, the PR responded to our Investigator's view to say that Mr and Mrs D alleged that Fractional Club membership had been sold to them as an investment and it provided evidence from them to that effect. I fail to understand how Mr and Mrs D disagreed with the view on the basis that their timeshare was sold as an investment if they did not know our Investigator's conclusions. It follows, I think it's more likely than not, that Mr and Mrs D did know about our Investigator's view before their evidence was provided.

So, I maintain that there is a risk that Mr and Mrs D's testimony was coloured by the Investigator's view and/or the outcome in *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*. And, on balance, the way in which the evidence has been provided leads me to conclude that I can place little weight on it.

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 D's purchasing decision.

The PR also said that in the judgment handed down in *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*, it was not challenged that the product in question was marketed and sold as an investment. But, as I explained in my PD, the Timeshare Regulations did not ban products such as the Fractional Club. They just regulated how such products were marketed and sold. And the judgment referred to did not make a blanket finding that all such products were mis-sold in the way the PR appears to be suggesting. Any complaint needs to be considered in the light of its specific circumstances.



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 D'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 D and the Lender was unfair to them for this reason.

### **Section 140A: Conclusion**

Given all of the factors I've looked at in this part of my decision, and having taken all of them into account, I'm not persuaded that the credit relationship between Mr and Mrs D and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement was unfair to them. So, I don't think it would be fair or reasonable that I uphold this complaint on that basis.

### **Overall 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 D's Section 75 claim. I'm 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.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons set out above, I don't uphold this complaint.

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

Asa Burnett  
**Ombudsman**