

The complaint

Mr B complains Revolut Ltd refuses to refund him for transactions on his account he says he didn't authorise.

What happened

Mr B says he noticed transactions on his Revolut account he didn't recognise and contacted Revolut straight away to inform it that these were fraudulent. Mr B says he doesn't know how these transactions were made but he is adamant they were unauthorised. He would like Revolut to refund them.

Revolut says it considered the transactions and the account records and it doesn't think these were unauthorised. Revolut says they were all completed on Mr B usual device, from his usual IP address and were verified via SMS to his usual phone number. It also says it has no evidence of any unrecognised devices logging into Mr B's app or any evidence of remote access to his account. So, it decided not to uphold his complaint.

Our investigator considered all the evidence provided and decided not to uphold the complaint. Mr B wasn't happy, so the complaint has been passed to me to consider.

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.

When considering what's fair and reasonable, I'm required to take into account relevant law and regulations; the regulator's rules, guidance and standards; the codes of practice; and, where relevant, what I consider good industry practice at the relevant time.

My role is to look at all the evidence, and then reach a decision that takes this into account and is fair to both parties. That means I consider Revolut's position as much as I do Mr B's. And what Mr B's asking for here is for Revolut to use its own funds to pay him back money that he says was removed from his account fraudulently.

Revolut decided not to uphold this complaint and so did our investigator. Having looked at all the evidence again, I don't think this outcome is unreasonable, and I'll explain why.

Revolut has provided evidence that the transactions in dispute were carried out via Mr B Revolut app, using Mr B's usual registered device. It has also supplied evidence that the transactions were verified via an SMS that was sent to his usual phone number, the same phone number we have registered on our records for Mr B. Through its investigation of Mr B's account, it has not found any suspicious devices linked to the account, nor has it found any evidence of remote access to the account. So, it came to the decision not to uphold Mr B's complaint. Having reviewed this evidence myself, and without any stronger evidence to the contrary, it seems more likely that not that Mr B was responsible for these transactions himself.

Mr B responded to the investigator's outcome questioning why he didn't consider the possibility that Mr B's phone had been hacked or taken over remotely by some fraudsters. In the process of our investigation, we asked Mr B if he had downloaded any suspicious apps or clicked any suspicious links in the recent past. Mr B's evidence is that he hadn't downloaded any apps or knowingly clicked on any suspicious links. Mr B also told us that no one else has had access to his device. So, I've not been given any evidence of remote access or the possibility of his phone being hacked to rely on here. Therefore, I am unable to uphold the complaint without any persuasive evidence that Mr B didn't authorise these transactions himself.

As a Service we are required to look at all the evidence provided and reach an outcome on what we think is more likely to have happened. In this case, I think the outcome Revolut has reached is reasonable as the evidence suggests it is more likely than not Mr B authorised these transactions himself.

My final decision

I am not upholding this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr B to accept or reject my decision before 2 July 2024.

Sienna Mahboobani
Ombudsman