

The complaint

Bamboo Limited provided Miss T with a loan on 20 October 2025 for £3,000 over 36 months with monthly repayments of £140.02. Miss T says Bamboo irresponsibly lent to her.

What happened

The details of this complaint are well-known to both parties, so I won't repeat them again here. The facts aren't in dispute, so I'll focus on giving the reasons for my decision.

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.

We've set out our general approach to complaints about unaffordable or irresponsible lending on our website, and I've taken this into account in deciding Miss T's case.

I've decided the loan was provided fairly because:

- I think the checks Bamboo did before providing the loan were reasonable given the loan value, the monthly repayments relative to Miss T's income and the stage in the lending relationship. It asked for her income and verified it externally and it asked for her housing costs. It completed a credit check to understand her credit commitments and repayment history. It ensured she would have sufficient income remaining to cover her living costs based on national statistics.
- The checks Bamboo completed showed Miss T would have around £1,300 monthly disposable income after taking on the loan. So, it was reasonable for Bamboo to conclude the loan was affordable for Miss T. Miss T had around £39,000 of debt at the time that was all well-managed and 40% of this was on a single hire purchase agreement. This debt was not wholly incremental as the stated purpose was debt consolidation. The credit check showed no adverse data such as arrears, defaults, CCJs or reduced payment plans. Miss T had no payday loans and was using £316 of her overdraft facility – she didn't use the facility every month. She was not using credit to withdraw cash and had only made one minimum payment in the last 12 months. So, I cannot see there were any signs of active, or pending, financial distress that Bamboo missed.
- Miss T has told this service she had gambling issues at the time. I can see she declared spend of £50 a month on gambling to Bamboo. I cannot see any reason that it ought to have doubted this, and I do not think it would have been proportionate for Bamboo to do more – such as reviewing bank statements - in the circumstances of this case.
- So, based on the information Bamboo gathered and what it knew about Miss T's situation, there was nothing to suggest Miss T was likely to be unable to sustainably repay what she was being lent.
- I don't think Bamboo acted unfairly in any other way.

This means I don't think Bamboo did anything wrong when it provided the loan to Miss T. 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 Bamboo lent irresponsibly to Miss T or otherwise treated her unfairly. I haven't seen anything to suggest that s.140A or anything else would, given the facts of this complaint, lead to a different outcome here.

I know this isn't the outcome Miss T hoped for. But for the reasons above, I'm not asking Bamboo to do anything to put things right.

My final decision

I am not upholding Miss T's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss T to accept or reject my decision before 13 April 2026.

Rebecca Connelley
Ombudsman