

## **The complaint**

Mr C complains that Revolut Ltd blocked his account and haven't explained why. He's also unhappy about the service he was provided.

## **What happened**

Mr C had a 'Metal' account with Revolut. This account came with additional benefits such as trading functions, as well as offering a premium level of customer service, for which Mr C had to pay a subscription fee each month.

In May 2020, Revolut blocked Mr C's account, while it carried out a review. Mr C complained and asked Revolut several times when it would unblock his account. Revolut said that it couldn't give him a timeframe as to when the review would be completed and asked Mr C to provide some information about his account. The account was blocked for 22 days.

Following completion of its review, Revolut unblocked Mr C's account and he was able to use it normally. Revolut apologised to Mr C for any inconvenience the block had caused him and refunded him two months of subscription fees. Mr C wasn't happy with this response. He said he didn't get the premium service he'd paid for and he'd had to chase Revolut to try and find out what was happening with his account. But Revolut wouldn't give him much information.

Mr C brought his complaint to our service. Before it was investigated Revolut offered Mr C £50 for the inconvenience the review had caused, which was declined.

An investigator looked at Mr C's complaint. She explained Revolut had certain legal and regulatory requirements they had to follow, which can lead to accounts being restricted. So, she didn't uphold the complaint.

Mr C disagreed. He wants Revolut to fully refund his metal subscription fee and increase its offer of compensation.

As no agreement could be reached the matter has come to me to decide.

## **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.

Firstly, the investigator was right to point out that Revolut has important legal and regulatory obligations it must meet when providing accounts to customers. These obligations are ongoing, so do not only pertain to when an account is opened. They can broadly be summarised as a responsibility to protect persons from financial harm, and to prevent and detect financial crime. To comply with its obligations Revolut may need to review an account and/or restrict its customers' access to accounts and funds held within them.

Having looked at all the evidence, including the information Revolut relied on to block Mr C's account, I'm satisfied that Revolut acted in accordance with these obligations when it blocked and reviewed Mr C's account. It was also entitled to do so under the account terms and conditions. I can see that in blocking the account Revolut were following an internal process which they carried out in order to comply with their legal and regulatory obligations. This was a legitimate exercise. And it wouldn't be appropriate to make an award of compensation for that since I don't believe Revolut treated Mr C unfairly in taking the actions it did.

I can appreciate not being able to access his account for just over three weeks would've caused Mr C worry and concern. And I can see from looking at Revolut's in app chat with Mr C, that he sent Revolut several emails trying to find out what was going on and when he would be able to access his account. But Revolut doesn't disclose to its customers what triggers a review of their accounts. And it's not obliged to provide Mr C with this information, as much as he'd like to know. So, I can't say it's done anything wrong by not giving Mr C this information. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to require it do so.

Mr C has said that due to the block and poor service he says he received he hasn't had the benefits of the metal subscription. And he wants the fees refunded. Whilst I can appreciate Mr C feels aggrieved, I can see that Mr C was able to continue to use his account once the block had been removed. And that Revolut has refunded him two months' worth of fees. I've thought carefully about whether I think this is fair and reasonable compensation in the circumstances. And I think it is. So, I'm not persuaded further compensation would be reasonable in this case.

In summary, based on the circumstances of this complaint, and the evidence I've received from both parties, I'm satisfied Revolut's actions are fair. So, it follows that I won't be asking Revolut to do anything more to resolve Mr C's complaint.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons I've explained, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr C to accept or reject my decision before 28 April 2022.

Sharon Kerrison  
**Ombudsman**