

The complaint

Mr W'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 him 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.

What happened

Mr W was the member of a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') – having purchased products from it previously. But the product at the centre of this complaint is his membership of a timeshare that I'll call the 'Fractional Club' – which he bought on 6 June 2017 (the 'Time of Sale'). He entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 1590 fractional points at a cost of £22,749 (the 'Purchase Agreement').

Fractional Club membership was asset backed – which meant it gave Mr W 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 his membership term ends.

Mr W paid for his Fractional Club membership by taking finance of £17,727.00 from the Lender (the 'Credit Agreement').

Mr W – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender on 16 June 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 did not deal with Mr W's concerns and failed to issue a final response letter. 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 W 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') dated 24 February 2026. In that decision, I said:

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.

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

- 1. Told that he had purchased an investment that would "considerably appreciate in value".*
- 2. Promised a considerable return on his investment because he was told that he would own a share in a property that would considerably increase in value.*
- 3. Told that he could sell his Fractional Club membership to the Supplier or easily to third parties at a profit.*
- 4. Made to believe that he 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 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.

So, while I recognise that Mr W - 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've set out above, I'm not persuaded that there was. And that means that I don't 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've already explained why I'm 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'm to consider this complaint in full – which is what I've done next.

Having considered the entirety of the credit relationship between Mr W 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 in relation to Fractional Club membership, including the contractual documentation and disclaimers made by the Supplier;*
3. *The commission arrangements between the Lender and the Supplier at the Time of Sale and the disclosure of those arrangements;*
4. *Evidence provided by both parties on what was likely to have been said and/or done at the Time of Sale;*
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 W and the Lender.

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

Mr W'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 weren't carried out before the Lender lent to Mr W. 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 W was actually unaffordable before also concluding that he lost out as a result and then consider whether the credit relationship with the Lender was unfair to him for this reason. But from the information provided, I am not satisfied that the lending was unaffordable for the Mr W.

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 W knew, amongst other things, how much he was borrowing and repaying each month, who he was borrowing from and that he was borrowing money to pay for Fractional Club membership. And as the lending doesn't look like it was unaffordable for him, 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 W financial loss – such that I can say that the credit relationship in question was unfair on him 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 him, even if the loan wasn't arranged properly.

The PR also says that there was 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 W in practice, nor that any such terms led him to behave in a certain way to his 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 W may have felt weary after a sales process that went on for a long time. But he says little about what was said and/or done by the Supplier during their sales presentation that made him feel as if he had no choice but to purchase Fractional Club membership when he simply did not want to. He was also given a 14-day cooling off period and he has not provided a credible explanation for why he did not cancel his membership during that time. And with all of that being the case, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that Mr W made the decision to purchase Fractional Club membership because his ability to exercise that choice was significantly impaired by pressure from the Supplier.

Overall, therefore, I don't think that Mr W credit relationship with the Lender was rendered unfair to him 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 him. And that's the suggestion that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to him 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 Mr W'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 W 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 W the prospect of a financial return – whether or not, like all investments, that was more than what he 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 W 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 him as an investment, i.e. told him or led him to believe that Fractional Club membership offered him 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 Mr W, the financial value of his 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's equally possible that Fractional Club membership was marketed and sold to Mr W 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.

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 Mr W 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 Mr W and the Lender that was unfair to him and warranted relief as a result, whether the Supplier's breach of Regulation 14(3) led him to enter into the Purchase Agreement and the Credit Agreement is an important consideration.

On my reading of the evidence before me, the prospect of a financial gain from the Fractional Club membership was not an important and motivating factor when Mr W made the decision to purchase it. That doesn't mean he wasn't interested in a share in the Allocated Property. After all, that wouldn't be surprising given the nature of the product at the centre of this complaint. But I'm conscious that the original Letter of Complaint makes no specific assertion about why Mr W decided to purchase the Fractional Club membership. The submissions at that point focused on the use of the term 'investment'.

It was only after our investigator issued their initial assessment that the PR provided Mr W's statement on 23 August 2023. The statement is typed but undated and unsigned. It relates to a purchase made in 2016 and also the purchase of which is the subject of this dispute. It is unclear from that statement which purchase Mr W refers to and so clarification was sought on 8 January 2024 from his PR. Mr W's response, also dated 8 January 2024 was;

Dear Adrianna, the fractional products in 2017 and 2018, were both described as investments for the future, not only would we get great holidays, years down the line when sold, we would get a share in the money they made from profits. These are the promises made to us, which convinced us to go ahead with the purchase of these products, we feel like we were sold the dream, but were conned from savings.

All that is said in relation to the issue of investment within the undated statement is this;

They made a promise of an iPad to the kids which got them excited they made an offer where we could sell the 5 holidays and get money back and we bought a share.

And

They also told us that we would be investing in a share of the property itself and when the resort sold it, we would get at least £20,000.

The PR has confirmed that this latter statement was likely related to the second purchase however.

Even so, this is a limited recollection of what the Supplier told him surrounding the issue of investment. It confirms that he understood that by buying Fractional Club membership he would get some money back when the Allocated Property was sold, but not that there was to be any profit or gain, only a share of the eventual sale proceeds. It was only when Mr W was asked for clarification that he then expanded a little to say he was told he would get a share in the profits made from an eventual sale.

When I consider the absence of any mention in the Letter of Complaint about Mr W's reasons for the purchase and balance that against his statement which confirms that he had effectively upgraded, it seems he made the Fractional Club purchase for the holidays the membership could provide to him, not that it was made for an investment.

He hasn't said anything which makes me think the Supplier did anything more than simply give a factual description of how the product worked. His recollection from the Time of Sale reflects a reasonable understanding of what purchasing Fractional Club membership was, but he says little about what it was that the Supplier said to him, or provided to him, that led him to believe the Allocated Property would only increase in value, or that he would make a profit.

But I also have other concerns about Mr W's statement. It was only after the judgment in 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') was handed down, that Mr W recalled that the Supplier led him to believe that Fractional Club membership offered him the prospect of a financial gain. And as experience tells me that, the more time that passes between a complaint and the event complained about, the more risk there is of recollections being vague, inaccurate and/or influenced by discussion with others, I find it difficult to understand why the Financial Ombudsman Service was only given such evidence when it was.

Indeed, as there isn't any other evidence on file to corroborate Mr W's evidence about his motivations at the Time of Sale, there seems to me to be a very real risk that Mr W's recollections were coloured by the judgment in Shawbrook & BPF v FOS. And with that being the case, I'm not persuaded that I can give his written recollections the weight necessary to finding that the credit relationship in question was unfair for reasons relating to a breach of the relevant prohibition.

As Mr W himself doesn't persuade me that his purchase was motivated by his share in the Allocated Property and the possibility of a profit, I don't think a breach of Regulation 14(3) by the Supplier was likely to have been material to the decision Mr W 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 Mr W'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 he would have pressed ahead with his 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 Mr W and the Lender was unfair to him even if the Supplier had breached Regulation 14(3).

The effect of the Supplier entering liquidation

PR says the sales companies of the Supplier started liquidation proceedings in December 2020 and this has deprived Mr W of the opportunity to recover monies through the Spanish Court. But PR hasn't explained why this is relevant to the complaint about the Lender. In any event, it is unclear how this action could have resulted in any unfairness in the relationship between Mr W and the Lender.

In conclusion, given the facts and circumstances of this complaint, I did not think that the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with Mr W's Section 75 claims, and I was not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with him under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to him for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA. And having taken everything into account, I could see no other reason why it would be fair or reasonable to direct the Lender to compensate him.

The Lender responded to the PD acknowledging receipt but making no further comment. The PR did not respond despite being sent a reminder so to do.

I'm therefore 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.

Whilst the Lender acknowledged receipt of my PD the PR did not and made no further comments beyond those already made. So as neither have said whether they disagree with any of my provisional conclusions, and since I haven't been provided with anything more by either party, I see no reason to change my conclusions as set out in my PD and reproduced above within this Final Decision.

Therefore, 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 Mr W's Section 75 claim, and I am not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with him under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to him 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 him.

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 W to accept or reject my decision before 13 April 2026.

Jonathan Willis
Ombudsman