

## The complaint

Mr P says Revolut Ltd acted unfairly when it closed his account(s) without giving any reasonable explanation

## What happened

Mr P opened an account with Revolut on 19 November 2017. On 8 April 2020 Revolut notified Mr P that it would be closing his account. This was done on 12 October 2020.

Mr P tried to open a second account on 14 April 2021 and a third account on 29 October 2021. Both accounts were closed by Revolut.

Mr P says he provided all the required documents and the clauses the bank is relying on to defend its decisions do not apply: he hasn't violated any of the account terms. He has the right to know why his accounts were terminated, he only applied for the second and third to try to understand what had happened on the first account. He will not be discriminated against and wants a full explanation: on what basis did Revolut decide not to offer him services?

Our investigator did not uphold the compliant. He said Revolut was within its rights to close the first and subsequent accounts and was not obliged to provide a reason for doing so.

Unhappy with this assessment Mr P asked for an ombudsman's review.

## 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.

Having done so I am not upholding Mr P's complaint. I'll explain why.

I understand that Mr P was upset when Revolut closed his accounts and that he remains frustrated that it has not provided a reason. That being said, in order to uphold this complaint, I'd need to be persuaded that Revolut made a mistake or did something it wasn't entitled to do. And, having reviewed all of the information provided, I don't think that was the case.

Mr P says it is unfair he has not been given a reason for the account closures and restrictions. Revolut has explained that it was acting in accordance with the terms and conditions of Mr P's account (clauses 23 and 24) and, having reviewed them, I'm satisfied that it was. Similarly, in the terms, clause 4 provides for Revolut not to offer an account to someone who has previously had an account closed, so I can find no error in its decision not to allow the second and third accounts.

Mr P wants to know why Revolut closed his account but Revolut isn't obliged to disclose the reason so I can't say it did anything wrong by not giving Mr P an explanation. Revolut has told this service broadly why it closed Mr P's account and, while I can't share these reasons

with Mr P, I am satisfied from its submission that it was entitled to reach this decision, based on its risk policy.

Mr P also raised the issue of discrimination. In terms of discrimination, it is for the Courts to determine if a business has acted unlawfully. Our role is to decide what's fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of each particular case. In reaching that decision, we will consider various factors including relevant law and what we see as good industry practice from the time.

So although it's for the Courts to say whether or not Revolut has breached the Equality Act 2010, I'm required to take it into account, if it's relevant, amongst other things when deciding what is fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

I did so as part of my review of this case. Mr P did not submit any specific evidence for me to consider in support of his claim. For the reason I've set out above, from what I have seen I'm satisfied that Revolut's actions were driven by its internal risk policy.

I know this isn't the answer Mr P was hoping for, and I appreciate the information I've given won't answer the questions he has. But I hope he can take some comfort from what I've said and the knowledge that an independent third-party has reviewed Revolut's actions and found no failings.

## My final decision

I am not upholding Mr P's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr P to accept or reject my decision before 10 August 2022.

Rebecca Connelley **Ombudsman**