

The complaint

Mr B is unhappy that Revolut decided not to refund him, after he was the victim of a scam.

What happened

Mr B received a message and call to say he was eligible for £454.65 in compensation from his internet provider as he was experiencing service issues. Of which he has provided a screenshot as evidence of this.

It appears, from Mr B's description of events, that during the course of his calls, with what he thought was his internet provider, they were able to gain remote access to his computer. As a result, two credits of £495 each, were made from Mr B's bank account held elsewhere, and topped up Mr B's existing Revolut account. This was followed by ten individual payments of £99 each, made from Mr B's Revolut account to a UK account held elsewhere – with the payee name entered as Mr B's. From there the funds were moved on again.

Mr B says he logged into his Revolut account but didn't make the payments, approve anything or share any passcodes to facilitate the payments.

Revolut investigated the matter, but said there was no evidence to show the payments had been made by anyone other than Mr B. The payments had been authorised through Mr B's registered mobile device. Which Mr B said he had at the time of the payments. And Revolut's security features prevents payments being made via remote access software.

One of our investigators looked into things. He didn't uphold Mr B's complaint. He said:

- He was unable to establish how a third party would have been able to make payments without Mr B's knowledge or consent
- The process required a new payee to be added to Mr B's Revolut account and approved. The evidence the investigator had seen showed the payee account name didn't match the destination account, but the payments were still authorised by the person making them.
- He acknowledged that Mr B downloaded remote access software but was satisfied the payments weren't made via remote access because Revolut's security systems prevented this.
- The payments from the Revolut account were funded by two credits from another of Mr B's bank accounts. And the investigator said he wasn't able to ascertain how a third party was able to make these transfers.
- Revolut's evidence, showed the payments were from Mr B's registered device. And Mr B said his mobile was in his possession. So, the investigator couldn't see how a third party could have made the payments. He concluded Mr B made and authorised them.
- He then went on to consider if the payments were unusual enough that Revolut ought to have considered whether Mr B was at risk of financial harm when they were being made. He said both the individual payments and total paid were of low value. And

although they were made in quick succession they were made to the same recipient. Overall, he didn't think Revolut made an error by not flagging the payments as suspicious.

Mr B didn't agree with the investigator's findings. He believed the value and quick succession of the payments ought to have flagged as suspicious with Revolut. He also believed Revolut failed in its due diligence on his behalf.

As the complaint couldn't be resolved it was passed to me. I asked Revolut for more detailed records of the account activity and devices that accessed Mr B's accounts. I'm also aware that the payment made from Mr B's other bank account to fund the payments from the Revolut account were made via open banking. This required the account to be linked to Mr B's Revolut account. And Revolut have provided evidence to show the steps to complete this and its official logs which record this information as well.

But as the complaint couldn't be resolved it has been passed to me. I'd like to apologise for the delay in reaching a finding on Mr B's complaint. I have been requesting information from Revolut during the course of my investigation. And, I have taken the time, to carefully and thoroughly review those records, before reaching an outcome on his complaint.

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 have come to the same conclusions as the investigator for the same reasons just based on additional information which further persuades me of this outcome. I'll explain my findings below.

Were the payments authorised by Mr B?

Mr B is adamant that he didn't make these transactions and so I've explored if there is any other way that they could have been made, without his consent, input or using his mobile device. But I'm afraid I haven't.

From Revolut's now detailed records, I can see that only Mr B's mobile device was used to make these transactions.

We now know that the payments made from Mr B's other bank account to his Revolut account were made through open banking – rather than Mr B (or someone else) specifically initiating a payment from that other bank account. But, in order to do that Mr B, or someone else, would have needed to link the bank account from Mr B's Revolut account. I have seen Revolut's records which show this occurred within Mr B's Revolut banking app and came from his registered device. So, I'm satisfied Mr B's mobile device was the source for all the payments being made and authorised.

Like the investigator, I have not been able to make a finding that the disputed payments were carried out by anyone else, other than Mr B. There are a few reasons for this:

- Revolut's records show that on the day of the disputed transactions his account was accessed using remote software. However, it shows that this was either blocked entirely or had very limited access to Mr B's account. And importantly, we're aware of Revolut's security systems which block remote access from progressing through certain payment and authorisation screens. So even if the fraudsters did have remote access to Mr B's mobile or computer devices, I'm satisfied they couldn't have got as far as making these transactions.

- The evidence I've seen shows Mr B's mobile device as consistently being used before, during and after the disputed payments – for all payments on the account. There is no evidence a different or new device was added or used, which could account for the payments being authorised from anywhere other than Mr B's device.
- Mr B has said his mobile device was in his possession the entire time and no-one else had access to it. So, I haven't been persuaded that someone other than him used his mobile phone to make the payments.
- Mr B may not have fully appreciated the steps he was taking or may not have recalled the events exactly as they occurred. But based on what I think is most likely to have happened, and what the evidence supports, I think it's more likely than not that Mr B authorised these payments from his Revolut account using his mobile device. And I've not seen any other evidence to persuade me something different happened.

As a result of this finding, I'm satisfied that Revolut was entitled to treat these payments as authorised.

Did Revolut need to intervene with the authorised payments?

I've considered whether there was anything about the circumstances surrounding the payments, that could have put Revolut on notice that they were being made as part of a scam. And I don't think there was.

I am satisfied that, taking into account longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements and what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time, Revolut should *fairly and reasonably* have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and have taken additional steps, or made additional checks, before processing payments in some circumstances.

But Revolut ought only do this, where it did, or ought to have identified that Mr B might be at heightened risk of fraud. And here I don't think there was any indication of this from the payments Mr B made as part of this scam. I'll explain why.

Overall, I don't think the payments Mr B made, were inherently suspicious. In considering this, I have to take into account what Revolut knew at the time Mr B made the payments and not take a retrospective approach that we now know he was scammed.

- Mr B's first payment of £99 was to a new payee appearing to go to an account in Mr B's name, and for a relatively low amount. The beneficiary account was held in the UK. So, these factors mean there wasn't anything suspicious about the new payee and the first payment.
- Revolut also provided a "confirmation of payee" check at the time, saying the account name didn't match the name that had been given, and I consider that to be a proportionate step in the circumstances. As I'm satisfied Mr B made the payments I'm also satisfied he would have received this notification and decided to proceed anyway.
- The payments were all for £99 each, and therefore not what I would consider unusually high in value. Mr B made one-off payments that were higher in value than this, on a regular basis from his Revolut account.
- In total the disputed transactions amount to £990, which is still a relatively low amount. Although I haven't seen that Mr B made transactions of that value in one day, previously on his account, the combined value is still low and therefore not suspicious.

- Mr B's account had been open for a number of years and was used regularly. And the credits into the account fund the disputed payments and leave the account with a positive balance. All of which don't give an indication of suspicious activity.
- I have given consideration to the frequency and volume of the payments. Mr B made ten payments in the space of 11 minutes. However, I have to balance that against the other information Revolut knew at the time. And I revert back to the individual and combined value of the payments being made. In doing so, I'm not persuaded that this reaches a threshold at which Revolut ought to have intervened with the payments.
- In addition to this there was a confirmation of payee check that came back as a no match. But again, these two factors don't outweigh the value of the transactions themselves.
- There is evidence that there was some remote access which occurred on Mr B's account prior to the payments being made. These show the access was either blocked entirely or had very limited access. And Revolut's security systems do not allow anyone using remote access to make payments. So, I don't think that this activity should have concerned Revolut that Mr B might not have been making the payments, or that combined with the other factors, it ought to have intervened with the payments.

In conclusion, I don't think the transaction and account activity for the disputed transactions was so unusual that Revolut should have been concerned Mr B was at risk of financial harm. So, I don't think Revolut made an error by not intervening when Mr B made the payments.

My final decision

I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr B to accept or reject my decision before 12 June 2025.

Sophia Smith
Ombudsman