

## **complaint**

Mr S complains Provident Personal Credit Limited didn't carry out proper affordability checks and irresponsibly granted him unaffordable loans. He says it put him into financial hardship. He wants the charges and interest refunded and his credit file amended.

## **background**

Provident said in its final response that Mr S had six loans between August 2010 and January 2011. Three were paid off and three remained outstanding. At the time these loans were granted it wasn't obliged to carry out a credit search. But it carried out checks and considered Mr S' income and outgoings. Its affordability checks were proportionate to the loan amounts. It discussed the loan applications face to face with Mr S. He said he could afford them. The account was sold to a third party in 2012.

Our adjudicator felt this complaint shouldn't be upheld. He said:

- Provident says it would've carried out credit and affordability checks on each loan application. And after Mr S became unable to meet the contractual payments it stopped lending to him. But unfortunately it hasn't been able to show that these checks were completed.
- He asked Mr S for his bank statements so he could assess his financial position and check whether the lending was responsible. But Mr S says he didn't have a bank account at the time.
- Provident hasn't been able to show it completed proper checks before approving these loans and Mr S has been unable to show they weren't affordable. So, he can't conclude the loans shouldn't have been lent. And it would be unfair and unreasonable to require Provident to refund any interest and charges as Mr S would like.

Mr S doesn't agree and has asked for an ombudsman review. He says Provident's lending wasn't responsible. It lent six loans in five months. It should've asked to see bank statements to see if the loans were affordable. He also had medical issues at the time of the loans.

## **my findings**

I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

I agree with the adjudicator's conclusions for the same reasons.

Mr S says he'd health issues at the time the loans were granted. But I've seen nothing to evidence them or to show any such issues were brought to Provident's attention.

It also appears Mr S may not have had a bank account at the time of these loans. So, even if it'd asked to see them (as Mr S has suggested it should) there weren't any. Overall I don't think Mr S has shown that these loans weren't affordable.

Although I recognise Mr S' frustration and personal situation, I don't think I can fairly or reasonably require Provident to refund any interest and charges or amend his credit file as

he'd like. And I don't see any compelling reason to change the proposed outcome in this case.

**my final decision**

I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr S to accept or reject my decision before 23 December 2016.

Stephen Cooper  
**ombudsman**