



The Financial Conduct Authority excluded a third of the victims of mis-sold interest rate swaps from a compensation scheme after pressure from the Treasury

ALAMY

Regulator 'saved banks billions' in loan scandal

James Hurley

Monday December 04 2023, 12.01am, The Times

Share



Saved



The City regulator has been accused of vastly underestimating how much it saved banks when it cut thousands of companies out of a compensation scheme for a lending scandal.

The Financial Conduct Authority has published its calculation for the “uncompensated losses” faced by businesses mis-sold interest rate swaps by banks, putting the figure at “anywhere between £200 million and £3 billion”.

[PREVIOUS ARTICLE](#)

[NEXT ARTICLE](#)

Business

unrealistic” and said the true saving for lenders was likely to have been in the tens of billions of pounds.

Small and medium-sized companies were paid [£2.2 billion in redress](#) after the regulator found widespread mis-selling of swaps. Sold as “protection” against the risk of rising interest rates, swaps left thousands of businesses with disastrously high costs when rates fell, wrecking many livelihoods.

In 2021, an independent review by John Swift KC found that the regulator had been wrong to exclude one in three mis-selling victims from compensation via the “last-minute” introduction of an eligibility cap.

ADVERTISEMENT

The FCA’s estimate of uncompensated losses arising from the eligibility cap appears in its defence in [judicial review proceedings](#), in which an all-party parliamentary group is challenging the authority’s decision not to accept Swift’s finding.

[PREVIOUS ARTICLE](#)

[NEXT ARTICLE](#)

Business

could be that low.”

Abhishek Sachdev, chief executive of Vedanta Hedging, a financial advisory service that has worked on hundreds of legal cases involving swaps, said: “The estimate the FCA have provided is completely unrealistic.” Sachdev, who advised the regulator on the redress scheme, said his own “conservative” analysis suggested the uncompensated losses were closer to £40 billion. He said he believed this was “the real reason the FCA can’t take this any further”.

The authority says it decided against ordering further compensation for several reasons, including “legal and practical impediments” to action; that it felt an “appropriate degree of protection” had already been provided; and that banks considered the matter closed.

SPONSORED



Can you help



The future of

The sophistication test was introduced after the Treasury pressured the FCA to reduce the costs of compensation amid fears that the redress bill was too high. This was after “intense” lobbying from bank bosses. However, Swift concluded that the redress scheme remained under the control of the regulator, despite Treasury attempts to influence it.

Swift was not given the FCA’s estimate while compiling his report. In March 2022, after the publication of his review, Swift told MPs on the Treasury select committee that he would need a “crystal ball” to produce such an estimate and the FCA “is not going to provide that figure”.

The regulator indicated that the estimate had been produced in 2021 after Swift provided provisional findings and was not intended for his review. It is understood to view the estimate as imprecise and to be based on several significant assumptions.

[PREVIOUS ARTICLE](#)

[NEXT ARTICLE](#)

Business

require the banks to provide redress to those excluded from the original scheme. As part of this, we produced a broad estimate of possible losses based on several significant assumptions. Our defence to the judicial review sets out clearly the reasons we decided not to seek further redress.”

Related articles

Banking scandal report ‘watered down’ after pressure from regulator

November 27 2023, 12.01am

James Hurley

NatWest to review Ulster Bank ‘fraud’

September 20 2023, 12.01am

James Hurley

Court grants fresh review of interest rate swaps mis-selling scandal

June 30 2023, 11.30am

James Hurley

Read more

Selling your home may be about to become harder

December 04 2023, 12.01am

Emma Powell

Bulb’s refer-a-friend scheme should have been taxed

December 04 2023, 12.03am

David Byers

Beauty firm Lush criticises Tories for ‘letting councils go bust’

December 04 2023, 12.01am

Isabella Fish, Retail Editor

[BACK TO TOP](#)

THE TIMES
LONDON

Get in touch

[About us](#)

[Contact us](#)

Business

[The Sunday Times Editorial Complaints](#)

[Place an announce](#)

[Classified advertising](#)

[Display advertisi](#)

[The Times corrections](#)

[The Sunday Tim](#)

[Careers](#)

[More from The Times and The Sunday Times](#)

[The Times e-paper](#)

[The Sunday Times Wine Club](#)

[The Times Archive](#)

[Sunday Times Driving](#)

[The Sunday Times Rich List](#)

[Good University Guide](#)

[Newsletters](#)

[Best Places to Stay](#)

[Podcasts](#)

[Times Luxury](#)

[Best Places to Work](#)

© Times Media Limited 2023.

Registered in England No. 894646.

Registered office: 1 London Bridge Street, SE1 9GF.

[Privacy & cookie policy](#)

[Licensing](#)

[Site map](#)

[Topics](#)

[Authors](#)

[Commissioning terms](#)

[Terms and conditions](#)

[PREVIOUS ARTICLE](#)

[NEXT ARTICLE](#)