

The complaint

Ms S complains about the way Topaz Finance Limited trading as Rosolite Mortgages handled her mortgage account during a period of financial hardship.

Ms S asks that we look into Rosolite's conduct, the fairness and clarity of the payment arrangement it agreed with her, remove arrears markers from her credit file, and award appropriate compensation.

What happened

Ms S has an interest only mortgage with Rosolite. She contacted Rosolite in 2024 as she was struggling with her mortgage payments. Ms S has multiple serious health conditions. Rosolite offered reduced payment arrangements. Ms S says Rosolite didn't tell her it would report arrears and non-payments to the credit reference agencies. She says this could prevent her re-mortgaging when the mortgage term expires in mid-2026.

Rosolite said while the reduced payment arrangement was in place it reported the arrangement to the credit reference agencies. After it ended, it reported Ms S's account as in arrears. It says this is a true reflection of the mortgage account.

Our investigator said Rosolite hadn't given Ms S clear information about when the arrangement would be in place. She said it hadn't taken Ms S's vulnerabilities into account and made reasonable adjustments. She said Rosolite should amend the arrears marker for November 2024 to show an arrangement in place and pay £300 compensation.

Rosolite didn't agree. It said it clearly told Ms S that the arrangement was agreed for August, September and October 2024, and its letter confirming this was clear and correct. It said it had offered support to Ms S and taken her vulnerabilities into account.

Ms S didn't agree either. She said her complaint isn't about the length of the reduced payment arrangement. It's that Rosolite recorded arrears and non-payments, despite her making a payment each month. She's worried about the effect this will have on her ability to remortgage before the term ends in July 2026.

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.

Rosolite agreed a reduced payment arrangement for May 2024 to July 2024. Rosolite wrote to Ms S to confirm the arrangement. This letter said that it (Rosolite) must notify the credit reference agencies if the account is one month or more payments in arrears, and update the status of the account each month.

In August 2024 Ms S asked for a further reduced payment arrangement. Rosolite agreed that Ms S could pay £500 for three months. Rosolite applied the arrangement for August, September and October 2024.

Ms S continued to make reduced payments in November and December 2024. Rosolite reported the account as in arrears.

The information Rosolite reported to the credit reference agencies was accurate in the sense that Ms S's account was in arrears. But that's not the end of the matter. Ms S says Rosolite didn't make her aware how the reduced payment arrangements would impact her credit file.

Rosolite has to provide clear and fair information in a way that a customer can understand. Where it's aware that a customer is vulnerable, it should tailor communication to meet the information needs of that customer, taking into account any characteristics of vulnerability. Ms S made Rosolite aware of her multiple serious health conditions and how they affect her.

I've listened to Ms S's calls with Rosolite in April 2024 and August 2024. During the August 2024 call, Ms S told Rosolite she couldn't remember part of the discussion on the previous call in April 2024. She said she has memory issues and a condition that affects her cognitive function. Ms S said she struggles with phone calls. She told Rosolite letters are better for her than calls, which she can't always answer. Ms S told Rosolite she's in constant pain. She has to prepare for calls and her severe cough can make talking difficult.

Rosolite told Ms S that concessions are usually temporary. Ms S said she'd look into getting support from the DWP and she was waiting to hear from a free advice service. Rosolite agreed a three month concession to give her time to do this. It said this would be for August, September and October 2024. It said the arrangement would show on her credit file, and if the account is in arrears of one month or more that would show on her credit file.

Rosolite did give Ms S correct information about when the arrangement would be in place, and what it would report to the credit reference agencies. But this was at the end of a call lasting nearly an hour. Ms S told Rosolite she struggles with phone calls, and has health problems that can affect her memory and cognitive function and is in constant pain.

In the circumstances, I think Rosolite needed to ensure its written confirmation about the reduced payment arrangement was clear and unambiguous, and contained the information Ms S needed to make an informed decision.

Rosolite wrote to Ms S confirming the arrangement. It said the arrangement would start on 14 August 2024 and end on 14 November 2024. It says Ms S would have known that this didn't include November 2024 as she makes payments on the 15th each month.

It's not clear to me that was the case. Ms S made a payment in November 2024 at the reduced payment amount. She didn't call Rosolite in November 2024 to ask to extend the arrangement. That could suggest she didn't know the arrangement ended before the payment due in November 2024.

I don't think the information Rosolite gave Ms S was sufficiently clear, given what she'd told it about her health conditions and how they affect her. Rosolite says it doesn't write to customers to remind them when an arrangement is coming to an end, something which might have helped Ms S here. I think there's sufficient uncertainty about what Ms S understood about the arrangement to make it fair to require Rosolite to record that the mortgage was in an arrangement in November 2024.

Rosolite wrote to Ms S in late November 2024 about her arrears and asked her to get in touch urgently. In early December 2024 Ms S asked Rosolite to extend the reduced payment arrangement. It declined and wrote to her to confirm this. It said Ms S had had time to take advice and her circumstances were unlikely to improve.

Ms S said her concern is that her credit file shows arrears and non-payment, when she's made a payment each month. Ms S is worried about the effect this will have on her ability to get a new mortgage, as the term of her interest only mortgage with Rosolite is due to expire in July 2026.

While I'm sorry to disappoint Ms S, I can't fairly require Rosolite to remove the arrears from her credit file for December 2024.

Rosolite says it reports the status of mortgage accounts at the end of each month. If there are arrears equal to one or more monthly payments, it reports the account as in arrears. Rosolite had given this information to Ms S on the call in August 2024 and in writing.

I think Ms S was aware in December 2024 that the reduced payment arrangement was no longer in place. By this time, Ms S had mortgage arrears of more than £2,000 – more than her monthly payment. I think it was accurate and fair for Rosolite to report the account as in arrears.

It's likely this will affect Ms S's ability to remortgage. But Rosolite has a duty to provide accurate and up to date information to the credit reference agencies. I can't fairly require it to remove this information. When Ms S submits a mortgage application, it's for the potential lender to decide how it views the information on her credit file.

It seems one of more of the credit reference agencies shows the arrears as missed payments. I appreciate Ms S's frustration about this as she's made a payment each month. But how the credit reference agencies show information isn't something Rosolite has any control over.

Ms S says a family member is helping her and she's recently cleared the mortgage arrears. That doesn't mean Rosolite has to remove arrears markers from the months when the account was in arrears. That information remains correct.

During the call in August 2024 Ms S asked Rosolite to add her son to the account. Rosolite said it would send a third-party authorisation form for Ms S to complete. It's appropriate for Rosolite to have processes in place to protect customers. But I think it could have done more here to support Ms S, given what she'd told it about her health conditions. For instance, it could have checked she was comfortable with completing and returning the form, if she'd need assistance, or if she needed her son added to the account more quickly. It could have said her son could join her on calls prior to the form being returned.

I think Rosolite failed to give Ms S sufficiently clear information about the second reduced payment arrangement, and could have done more to adapt its communications and processes in light of what it knew about her medical conditions. Taking into account the effect this had on Ms S, I think it's fair and reasonable to require Rosolite to pay compensation of £300.

Ms S says Rosolite reported a missed payment in June 2025 and September 2025, even though she made payments in those months. She provided a screen shot from a credit report which shows missed payments for those months. Other months (e.g. May, July, August and October 2025) are shown as in an arrangement to pay. As this was not part of the complaint that Ms S raised with Rosolite and brought to us, I can't fairly look into this here. Ms S should raise these more recent issues with Rosolite.

My final decision

My decision is that I uphold this complaint and order Topaz Finance Limited trading as

Rosolite Mortgages to:

- amend the information reported to the credit reference agencies for November 2024 to show Ms S's mortgage account was in a reduced payment arrangement, and
- pay £300 to Ms S.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Ms S to accept or reject my decision before 18 March 2026.

Ruth Stevenson
Ombudsman