

The complaint

D, a business, complains that Revolut Ltd declined an application for a business account and would not explain why.

What happened

D applied for an account and as it was unsuccessful asked Revolut for the reasons why. D was not satisfied with the answer given the financial standing of its owner and the nature of its business activity. It said that Revolut had not acted fairly.

Our investigator did not recommend that the complaint be upheld. She said that Revolut could decide who it wanted to do business with. Revolut had said it followed its normal checks and applied its commercial judgement. It did not have to give any further explanation and she did not see it had acted unfairly.

D did not agree. It said that Revolut should not decline an application without a proper reason. It must treat new and existing customers fairly and any differentiation needs to be objectively justified as set out in established case law. Although there are some criteria given in the terms and conditions D meets all those and in practice Revolut has already accepted applications in its area of business. It claimed discrimination between businesses.

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 provide informal dispute resolution and we are not a court. If D wants to pursue a legal case against Revolut then it is free to do so if it does not accept my decision and subject to any relevant time limits.

In the final response to D about the complaint Revolut said that apart from its published eligibility criteria “... *there are many other internal reviews and checks run by the on-boarding team. I am afraid, due to internal policies, we won't be able to provide detailed information regarding why the application was declined.*”

I'm satisfied that Revolut fairly considered D's application and applied its normal review processes without any error. I think it's reasonable for it to keep the nature of its checks confidential and not to disclose these to D. I do not see that this has created any element of unfairness. And so, I know the owner of D will be disappointed when I say that I won't be asking it to do anything more.

My final decision

My decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask D to accept or

reject my decision before 21 September 2020.

Michael Crewe
Ombudsman