

The Complaint

Miss P's complaint is, in essence, that Clydesdale Financial Services Limited trading as Barclays Partner Finance (the 'Lender') acted unfairly and unreasonably by (1) being party to an unfair credit relationship with her 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

Miss P, and another party, were members of a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') – having purchased a trial membership from it in July 2016. But the product at the centre of this complaint is their membership of a timeshare that I will call the 'Fractional Club' – which they bought on 8 January 2017 (the 'Time of Sale'). They entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 910 fractional points at a cost of £16,760 (the 'Purchase Agreement'). But after trading in their trial membership, the cost of their Fractional Club membership was £12,765.

Miss P paid for their Fractional Club membership by taking finance of £16,349 from the Lender (the 'Credit Agreement') in her sole name. This finance included £3,584 to pay off some outstanding finance relating to their trial membership. Whilst the Purchase Agreement was in joint names, Miss P is the only eligible claimant (and complainant) under the Credit Agreement. For that reason, I shall refer to Miss P only throughout this decision.

Fractional Club membership was asset backed – which meant it gave Miss P 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 her membership term ends.

Miss P – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender on 4 August 2022 (the 'Letter of Complaint') to raise a number of different concerns. As those concerns have not changed since they were first raised, and as both sides are familiar with them, it is not necessary to repeat them in detail here beyond the summary above.

The Lender dealt with Miss P's concerns as a complaint and issued its final response letter on 22 October 2024, 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.

Miss P disagreed with the Investigator's assessment and asked for an Ombudsman's decision – which is why it was passed to me.

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 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 is not necessary to set out that context here.

What I have provisionally decided – and why

I have considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what is fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint. And having done that, I do not think this complaint 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 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

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 does not dispute that the relevant conditions are met. But for reasons I will come on to below, it is not necessary to make any formal findings on them here.

It was said in the Letter of Complaint that Fractional Club membership had been misrepresented by the Supplier at the Time of Sale because Miss P was:

- 1. Told that she had purchased an investment that would "considerably appreciate in value".*
- 2. Promised a considerable return on her investment because she was told that she would own a share in a property that would considerably increase in value.*
- 3. Told that she could sell her Fractional Club membership to the Supplier or easily to third parties at a profit.*
- 4. Made to believe that she 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 a honestly held opinion as there is not 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 is possible that Fractional Club membership was misrepresented at the Time of Sale for one or both of those reasons, I do not think it is probable. She has given little to none of the colour or context necessary to demonstrate that the Supplier made false statements of existing fact and/or opinion. And as there is not any other evidence on file to support the suggestion that Fractional Club membership was misrepresented for these reasons, I do not think it was.

So, while I recognise that Miss P - and the PR - have concerns about the way in which Fractional Club membership was sold by the Supplier, when looking at the claim under Section 75 of the CCA, I can only consider whether there was a factual and material misrepresentation by the Supplier. For the reasons I have set out above, I am not persuaded that there was. And that means that I do not think that the Lender acted unreasonably or unfairly when it dealt with this particular Section 75 claim.

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

I have already explained why I am not persuaded that Fractional Club membership was actionably misrepresented by the Supplier at the Time of Sale. But there are other aspects of the sales process that, being the subject of dissatisfaction, I must explore with Section 140A in mind if I am to consider this complaint in full – which is what I have done next.

Having considered the entirety of the credit relationship between Miss P and the Lender along with all of the circumstances of the complaint, 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 Miss P and the Lender.

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

Miss P's complaint about the Lender being party to an unfair credit relationship was made for several reasons.

The PR says, for instance, that the right checks were not carried out before the Lender lent to Miss P. I have not 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 Miss P was actually unaffordable before also concluding that she lost out as a result and then consider whether the credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to her for this reason. But from the information provided, I am not satisfied that the lending was unaffordable for Miss P.

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 was not permitted to enforce the Credit Agreement. However, it looks to me like Miss P knew, amongst other things, how much she was borrowing and repaying each month, who she was borrowing from and that she was borrowing money to pay for Fractional Club membership. And as the lending does not look like it was unaffordable for her, even if the Credit Agreement was arranged by a broker that did not have the necessary permission to do so (which I make no formal finding on), I cannot see why that led to a financial loss for Miss P – such that I can say that the credit relationship in question was unfair on her as a result. And with that being the case, I am not persuaded that it would be fair or reasonable to tell the Lender to compensate her, even if the loan was not arranged properly.

The PR also says that there was one or more unfair contract terms in the Purchase Agreement. But as I cannot see that any such terms were operated unfairly against Miss P in practice, nor that any such terms led her to behave in a certain way to her detriment, I am not persuaded that any of the terms governing Fractional Club membership are likely to have led to an unfairness that warrants a remedy.

Overall, therefore, I do not think that Miss P's credit relationship with the Lender was rendered unfair to her 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 her. And that is the suggestion that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to her as an investment in breach of 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 am satisfied, that Miss P'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 Miss P was 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 Miss P 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 does not 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 Miss P 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 her as an investment, i.e. told her or led her to believe that Fractional Club membership offered her 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 Miss P, 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 that the Supplier's sales process left open the possibility that the sales representative may have positioned Fractional Club membership as an investment. So, I accept that it is equally possible that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to Miss P 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 the Consumer rendered unfair?

Having found that 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 Miss P 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 am to conclude that a breach of Regulation 14(3) led to a credit relationship between Miss P and the Lender that was unfair to her and warranted relief as a result, whether the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) led her to enter into the Purchase Agreement and the Credit Agreement is an important consideration. To help me decide this point, I've carefully considered what Miss P has said in the course of her complaint about how the membership was sold to her and her motivation for taking it out.

As I've stated above, it is said within the Letter of Complaint that Miss P was told that she had purchased an investment that would increase in value and was promised a considerable return. There was no further detail underpinning these statements within the

Letter of Complaint.

The PR has provided a statement from Miss P containing her recollections from the Time of Sale. Within it, Miss P says:

“The term ‘Fractional’ was explained to me as meaning that I owned a fractional share in a Specific property with the [Supplier] portfolio, rather than merely the right to use accommodations.

I was led to believe that Fractional Ownership had several advantages over traditional holiday membership including, ‘Potential for value appreciation’

.....

It was suggested that at the end of the contract, my share would be sold, and I would receive a financial return.

....

Unlike a traditional membership, which only provided vacation rights with no financial return, I understood that Fractional Ownership was linked to property investment, supposedly offering long-term benefits and resale potential.

I was assured that: my investment would gain value over time. At the conclusion of the ‘19- year contract [Supplier] would sell the property assets, and fractional owners would receive a share of the proceeds”.

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 she decided to go ahead with her purchase. I say this as there is no suggestion that Miss P purchased her membership due to her share in the Allocated Property with the hope or expectation of making a profit. Rather, she does correctly recollect that she would receive her share of the Allocated Property once sold, which is a factual description of how the eventual sale of the Allocated Property worked.

Miss P’s membership also provided her with holiday rights and she says, “The scheme was resented as more prestigious and beneficial than conventional holiday memberships, allowing greater flexibility in usage”. The Lender has shared a copy of the sales note, and this suggests Miss P was interested in holidays – ‘They have no children at the moment and want to take as many holidays as they can’. And this seems to be corroborated by her reservation history which confirms she travelled on seven occasions between 2018 and 2022. Given that she held a trial membership which was traded in at the Time of Sale, I think this demonstrates a level of interest she had in the type of holidays the Supplier offered so I think Miss P was motivated to purchase the membership due to the holiday options it offered her.

That does not mean she was not interested in a share in the Allocated Property. After all, that would not be surprising given the nature of the product at the centre of this complaint. But as Miss P herself does not persuade me that her purchase was motivated by her share in the Allocated Property and the possibility of a profit, I do not think a breach of Regulation 14(3) by the Supplier was likely to have been material to the decision Miss P 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 Miss P’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 she would have pressed ahead with her 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 Miss P and the Lender was unfair to her even if the Supplier had breached Regulation 14(3).

Insolvency of the Supplier and its implications on the Credit Agreement

The PR argues that, because the Supplier's Spanish based sales companies have closed, Miss P will not recover any amounts that are expected to be awarded by the Spanish court. But this is of no impact on the complaint because (1) I cannot see that the Supplier (i.e., company that entered into the Purchase Agreement) is itself the subject of a court judgment in Mr and Miss P's favour nor can I see that the Lender has been party to any court proceedings and (2) even if he had a claim for something, there is no explanation as to why the Lender would be responsible to answer it.

Overall, given the facts and circumstances of this complaint, I am not persuaded that it would be fair or reasonable to uphold it 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 Miss P's Section 75 claim, and I am not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with her under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to her 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 her."

The Lender responded to the PD and accepted it.

The PR also responded. It did not accept the PD and provided some further comments it wanted me to take into account.

Having received the relevant responses from both parties, I'm now finalising 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.

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 is not necessary to set out that context in detail here. But 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

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 only relate to the issue of whether the credit relationship between Miss P and the Lender was unfair. In particular, the PR has provided further comments in relation to whether the membership was sold to Miss P as an investment at the Time of Sale. It has also now argued for the first time that the payment of a commission by the Lender to the Supplier led to an unfair credit relationship.

As outlined in my PD, the PR originally raised various other points of complaint, all of which I addressed at that time. But it didn't make any further comments in relation to those in their response to my PD. Indeed, it hasn't said it disagrees 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 PR has highlighted under Section 140B (9) of the CCA, the burden of proof falls on the Lender to disprove the allegation that its relationship with Miss P was unfair. I agree that this is correct, placing a burden on lenders during the process of litigation. That does not mean, though, that the Lender – or I – should take a claim at face value. There remains an onus on Miss P to provide some evidence for the claim she is making, despite the overall burden of proof resting with the Lender, as was set out in the judgment in *Smith and another v Royal Bank of Scotland plc* [2023] UKSC 34 at paragraph 40. I also remind both parties that it is my role to make findings on what I consider to be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of any given complaint.

The Supplier's alleged breach of Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare regulations

In its response to my PD, the PR has reasserted its view that the Supplier marketed the Fractional Club membership to Miss P as an investment and that this was a motivating factor in her decision.

I accepted in my PD that the membership may well have been marketed as an investment to Miss P in breach of the prohibition in Regulation 14(3) of the Timeshare Regulations. I also explained that while the Supplier's sales processes left open the possibility that the sales representative may have positioned Fractional Club membership as an investment, it wasn't necessary for me to make a finding on this as it is not determinative of the outcome of the complaint. I explained that regulatory breaches do not automatically create unfairness and that such breaches and their consequences (if there are any) must be considered in the round, rather than in a narrow or technical way. The PR's response to my PD hasn't changed my view of this, and so whether the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) led Miss P to enter into the Purchase Agreement and the Credit Agreement remains an important consideration.

In my PD I explained the reasons why I didn't think any breach of Regulation 14(3) had led Miss P to proceed with her purchase. In short, I was not persuaded that her decision was motivated by the prospect of a financial gain (i.e., a profit). In reaching that view, I took into account the testimony given by Miss P in the course of her complaint. I recognise the PR has interpreted Miss P's testimony differently to how I have, and I have carefully considered its further comments. Ultimately though, they have not led me to a different conclusion.

The PR objects to the approach I've taken in assessing this aspect of the complaint, believing that I have detracted from the judgment in *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*¹ and the case law that contributed to it, by requiring Miss P to have been "primarily or mainly motivated" by the investment element in order to uphold the complaint. But I did not make such a finding. I said that, in my view, Miss P was motivated by the holiday options offered by the Supplier – which was a factor in my overall conclusion in light of all the available evidence that she would, on balance, have pressed ahead with her purchase of the Fractional Club membership even if there had been a breach of Regulation 14(3).

The PR say Miss P's existing trial membership provided her with access to the same style of holidays and experiences so it thinks it would be reasonable to conclude the investment aspect was the major motivating factor in Miss P's decision to purchase. I don't agree with the PR's point of view. From my knowledge, the trial membership provided a set number of holidays over a set period of time and the intention of the product was to provide customers, like Miss P, with a flavour of the experiences they could receive from entering into a longer term contract with the Supplier.

The PR comments on my reference to the sales notes, highlighting they are not an official transcript of the meeting or phone call and that they were created by the sales representatives who the PR says mis-sold the timeshare as an investment. I don't disagree with some of the points the PR has made here. I've considered the sales notes along with all of the other evidence available on Miss P's complaint, including her testimony to help me understand how her membership may have been sold to her and her motivations for taking it out.

The PR says Miss P's testimony is detailed and precise as to how the Fractional Club membership was marketed and what her motivations were for purchasing. Miss P has, in my opinion, set out how the membership was sold to her and based on what she's said, I'd

¹ 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').

agree that it's possible the Supplier marketed and sold Miss P's membership to her as an investment as she suggests. But I'm not convinced Miss P's motivation to purchase Fractional Club membership at the Time of Sale was because it was an investment, with the possibility of a profit at the end – nor is this something that Miss P has clearly set out in her witness statement as the PR suggests.

So for the reasons given in my PD and above, I still do not think that any breach of Regulation 14(3), if there was one, was material to Miss P's decision to purchase the Fractional Club membership.

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 Miss P in arguing that her credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to her 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 Miss P, 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 Miss P 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 Miss P.

In stark contrast to the facts of Mr Johnson's case, from my understanding of how the Supplier operated at the Time of Sale, the amount of commission paid by the Lender to the Supplier was no more than 2.5% of the amount borrowed. So, had she known at the Time of Sale that the Supplier was going to be paid a rate of commission at that level, I'm not currently persuaded that she either wouldn't have understood that or would have otherwise questioned the size of the payment at that time. After all, Miss P wanted Fractional Club membership and had no obvious means of her own to pay for it. And at such a low level, the impact of commission on the cost of the credit she needed for a timeshare she wanted doesn't strike me as disproportionate. So, I think she would still have taken out the loan to fund her 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 Miss P but as the supplier of contractual rights she 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 her 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 Miss P.

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 Miss P and the Lender under the Credit Agreement and related Purchase Agreement was unfair to her. 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 found that Miss P's credit relationship with the Lender wasn't unfair to her 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 Miss P'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 Miss P (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 Miss P 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 she would still have taken out the loan to fund her purchase at the Time of Sale had there been more adequate disclosure of the commission arrangements that applied at that time.

Overall 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 Miss P's Section 75 claim, and I am not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with her under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to her 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 her.

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 Miss P to accept or reject my decision before 2 March 2026.

Sameena Ali
Ombudsman