

## The complaint

Mrs M'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/claims] under Section 75 of the CCA.

## What happened

Mrs M purchased membership of a timeshare (the 'Fractional Club') from a timeshare provider (the 'Supplier') on 24 April 2017 (the 'Time of Sale'). She entered into an agreement with the Supplier to buy 1,200 fractional points at a cost of £10,338.00 (the 'Purchase Agreement').

Fractional Club membership was asset backed – which meant it gave Mrs M 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.

Mrs M paid for her Fractional Club membership by taking finance of £10,338.00 from the Lender (the 'Credit Agreement').

Mrs M – using a professional representative (the 'PR') – wrote to the Lender on 3 April 2025 (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 Mrs M's concerns as a complaint and issued its final response letter on 9 May 2025, 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.

Mrs M 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:

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

*Liability under section 75 isn't based on anything the lender does wrong, but upon the misrepresentations and breaches of contract by the supplier, for which the said section imposes on the lender a 'like claim' to that which the borrower enjoys against the supplier. If the lender is notified of a valid section 75 claim, it should pay its liability, and if it fails or refuses to do so, then that can give rise to a complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service.*

*However, I don't think it would be fair or reasonable to uphold this complaint for reasons relating to Mrs M's section 75 claim. As a general rule, creditors can reasonably reject section 75 claims that they are first informed about after the claim has become time-barred under the Limitation Act 1980 (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 be available in court. So, it is relevant to consider whether Mrs M's section 75 claim was time-barred under the LA before she put it to the Lender.*

*As I have said, a claim under section 75 is a 'like' claim against the creditor and mirrors the claim the consumer could make against the Supplier.*

*A claim for misrepresentation against the Supplier would ordinarily be made under section 2(1) of the Misrepresentation Act 1967, and for which, by reason of section 2 of the LA, the time period for making a claim expires six years from the date on which the cause of action accrued.*

*But a claim, like the one in question here under section 75, is also 'an action to recover any sum by virtue of any enactment'. By reason of section 9 of the LA, the limitation period is also six years from the date on which the cause of action accrued.*

*The date on which the cause of action accrued was the Time of Sale. I say this because Mrs M entered into the purchase of her timeshare at that time based on the alleged misrepresentations of the Supplier – which she says she relied on. And as the loan from the Lender was used to help finance the purchase, it was when she entered into the Credit Agreement that she suffered a loss.*

*Mrs M first notified the Lender of her section 75 claim on 3 April 2025, and as more than six years had passed between Time of Sale and when she first put her claim to the Lender, I don't think it was unfair or unreasonable of the Lender to reject Mrs M's concerns about the Supplier's alleged misrepresentations.*

*But even if I am wrong about that, although I don't think I am, 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 Mrs M were:*

- 1. Told that she had purchased an investment that would "considerably appreciate in value" when that was not true.*
- 2. Told that she would own a share in a property that would increase in value during the membership term when that was not true.*
- 3. Made to believe that she would have access to "the holiday apartment" at any time all year round when that was not true.*

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 enough 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 point 3, while it's possible that Fractional Club membership was misrepresented at the Time of Sale for that reason, I don't think it's probable. It's given little to none of the colour or context necessary to demonstrating that the Supplier made a false statement 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 that reason, I don't think it was.

So, while I recognise that Mrs M 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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M and the Lender.

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

Mrs M'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 Mrs M. 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 Mrs M 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 the Mrs M.

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 Mrs M 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 doesn't look like it was unaffordable for her, 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 Mrs M financial loss – 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'm not persuaded that it would be fair or reasonable to tell the Lender to compensate her, even if the loan wasn't arranged properly.

Overall, therefore, I don't think that Mrs M 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's 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 Mrs M'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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M the prospect of a financial return – whether or not, like all investments, that was more than what she 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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M, the financial value of her 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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M 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.*

*On my reading of the evidence supplied to me, the prospect of a financial gain from the Fractional Club membership was not an important and motivating factor when Mrs M made her decision to purchase the Allocated Property, although that doesn't mean she wasn't interested in a share in it. After all, that wouldn't be surprising given the nature of the product at the centre of this complaint. However, the original Letter of Complaint makes no mention of why Mrs M decided to purchase the Fractional Club membership, and I note the submissions at that point focused on the use of the term 'investment'.*

*The PR provided Mrs and Mr M's statement, dated 2 April 2025, to the Financial Ombudsman Service on 12 September 2025. The timing of this statement concerns me as it was prepared 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. The significance of this is that there is a likelihood that Mrs M's recollections that the Supplier led her to believe that Fractional Club membership offered her the prospect of a financial gain were influenced by this judgment. My concern stems from the fact that experience tells me that, the more time that passes between a complaint and the event complained about, and here there has been approximately six and a half years, the more risk there is of recollections being vague, inaccurate and/or influenced by discussion with others.*

*When I consider what Mrs has said about her reasons for the purchase of her membership, I note that this is a somewhat limited recollection, lacking in the detail one might expect to see from a person parting with a not inconsiderable sum for investment purposes. I would have expected to see more evidence of the scrutiny of those offering the investment opportunity, but here there is none, save for the following, which is vague and generic.*

*She said,*

*Whilst on holiday in September 2018, the sales team brought to our attention, there was an outstanding maintenance fee which we were not aware of. We mentioned that the original sale was not good for us no longer as our circumstances had changed, with Mrs M's mother being diagnosed with dementia. We asked on many occasions how we could terminate the agreement, but they persisted to inform us that wasn't possible, even under the circumstances.*

*The only option given to us was to upgrade the agreement, which would provide us with better payments and a better chance of using their products. They also told us that it would provide us with a better opportunity of making more financial gain at the end of the investment. They said a return of approximately 15 to 20% returned on top of our investment would be the sort of figure we could expect at the end of the agreement, we reluctantly agreed and a second loan was agreed with Shawbrook Bank Ltd.*

*They said the new product would give us more opportunity to use the apartments available, which when we wanted to see what availability there was at a later date, was not the case at all.*

*What I take from this is that Mrs M wished to divest herself of the membership she had purchased in April 2017 for reasons associated with her mother's health. This does not suggest that her wish to terminate the agreement was investment related, since there is no mention of it. In other words, had that membership been purchased with a view to investment, having taken the decision to then terminate her investment I would have expected more comment from her regarding how the investment had progressed and why she was wishing to end it. I cannot see a logical argument here as to why this investment would be terminated because of Mrs M's mother's health.*

*What follows in her statement is her comment regarding her and Mr M's purchase a year later. I appreciate that this purchase is not the subject of this complaint, but it provides useful context, since Mrs and Mr M go on to say that they then reluctantly agreed to purchase the membership. This emphasises that they were not purchasing that membership as an investment, since it would be odd for someone to make such an investment 'reluctantly'.*

*Their statement then confirms that the reason for that purchase was to have better prospects of using available apartments.*

*I do acknowledge they have also said that they were told there would be a better opportunity of making more financial gain at the end of the investment and have quoted a return of 15 to 20%, but I am not persuaded that this is an accurate recollection of what was actually said, given the timing of their statement, and for the reasons I set out above. There is also no other evidence on file to corroborate Mrs M's evidence about her motivations at the Time of Sale.*

*So, when I take this into account having concluded that this second purchase Mrs M made with Mr M was not for investment purposes, I cannot see that Mrs M's first purchase was either.*

*In short, it seems that Mrs M made the Fractional Club purchase for the holidays the membership could provide to her and her husband, and there is a very real risk that her recollection has been coloured by the judgment in *Shawbrook & BPF v FOS*, so much so that I cannot give her written recollection the weight necessary to finding that the credit relationship in question was unfair for reasons relating to a breach of the relevant prohibition.*

*As Mrs M herself doesn't persuade me that her purchase was motivated by her 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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M'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 Mrs M and the Lender was unfair to her even if the Supplier had breached Regulation 14(3).*

### **The provision of information by the Supplier at the Time of Sale**

*The PR says that Mrs M were not given sufficient information at the Time of Sale by the Supplier about the ongoing costs of Fractional Club membership. The PR also says that the contractual terms governing the ongoing costs of membership and the consequences of not meeting those costs were unfair contract terms.*

*As I've already indicated, the case law on Section 140A makes it clear that it does not automatically follow that regulatory breaches create unfairness for the purposes of the unfair relationship provisions. The extent to which such mistakes render a credit relationship unfair must also be determined according to their impact on the complainant.*

*I acknowledge that it is also possible that the Supplier did not give Mrs M sufficient information, in good time, on the various charges she could have been subject to as Fractional Club members in order to satisfy the requirements of Regulation 12 of the Timeshare Regulations (which was concerned with the provision of 'key information'). But even if that was the case, I cannot see that the ongoing costs of membership were applied unfairly in practice. And as neither Mrs M nor the PR have persuaded me that she would not have pressed ahead with her purchase had the finer details of the Fractional Club's ongoing costs been disclosed by the Supplier in compliance with Regulation 12, I cannot see why any failings in that regard are likely to be material to the outcome of this complaint given its fact and circumstances.*

*As for the PR's argument that there were one or more unfair contract terms in the Purchase Agreement, I can't see that any such terms were operated unfairly against Mrs M in practice, nor that any such terms led her to behave in a certain way to her detriment. And with that being the case, 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.*

### **Mrs M's Commission Complaint**

*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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M, 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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M.*

*In stark contrast to the facts of Mr Johnson's case, the amount of commission paid by the Lender to the Supplier for arranging the Credit Agreement that Mrs M entered into wasn't high. At £258.45, it was only 2.5% of the amount borrowed and even less than that (2.32%) as a proportion of the charge for credit. So, had she known at the Time of Sale that the Supplier was going to be paid a flat 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, Mrs M 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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M.*

### **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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M (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 Mrs M 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.*

### **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 Mrs M 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 Mrs M and the Lender.*

### **My provisional decision**

*In conclusion, as things currently stand, I do not think that the Lender acted unfairly or unreasonably when it dealt with the relevant Section 75 claim(s), and if I put the issue of commission to one side for the time being, I am not persuaded that the Lender was party to a credit relationship with Mrs M under the Credit Agreement that was unfair to her for the purposes of Section 140A of the CCA – nor do I see any 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, although the PR did not and as the time for submission of further responses has passed 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.

Whilst the Lender acknowledged receipt of my PD and accepted it, the PR did not respond and has made no further comments beyond those already made prior to the issue of my PD.

So, as the PR has not said whether they disagree with any of my provisional conclusions, and since I haven't been provided with anything more evidence or submissions from them, I see no reason to change my conclusions as set out in my PD and reproduced above within this Final Decision.

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 Mrs M'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 Mrs M to accept or reject my decision before 24 May 2026.

Jonathan Willis  
**Ombudsman**