

The complaint

Mr W has complained Revolut Ltd dealt with his cash machine dispute ineffectively and then offered him compensation that was unsuitable.

What happened

Mr W used a cash machine on 19 March. His card was retained by the cash machine. He got onto Revolut to complain. He asked for the £20 that had been debited from his account to be refunded.

Revolut ended up treating this as a chargeback complaint as they believed Mr W had authorised the transaction and then changed his mind. He'd meant to withdraw £10 rather than try to withdraw £20. Mr W believed Revolut had compounded their error by then treating his complaint as two separate issues so brought his complaint to our service.

Despite Revolut refunding £20 to Mr W's account on 24 April, Mr W remained unhappy with the compensation Revolut offered. This was three month's subscription to Revolut's premium service which Mr W felt wasn't something he wanted.

Our investigator didn't feel that Revolut had done anything wrong in treating his dispute as a chargeback issue. He wasn't going to ask Revolut to do anything further.

Still unhappy, Mr W has asked an ombudsman to consider 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've reached the same outcome as our investigator. I'll explain why.

I've considered both aspects of Mr W's complaint – the cash withdrawal being treated as a chargeback rather than a fraud complaint and the compensation being inappropriate.

Firstly, based on the evidence I've considered I'm satisfied Mr W used a cash machine and authorised a withdrawal of £20. He then changed his mind and his card ended up being retained by the machine and Mr W was debited.

Mr W is right in saying a fraud claim would have been dealt with differently. The Payment Services Regulations requires financial institutions to refund customers within a reasonable period if they didn't authorise a transaction. However, as I've already confirmed I believe Mr W did authorise this transaction, so I don't believe Revolut did anything wrong in treating this as a claim under the international card schemes chargeback rules.

In fact, Mr W was refunded within 35 days so slightly quicker than the refund could have taken place. There's no error here.

I appreciate Mr W feels the subscription offer is inadequate as this isn't a service he wants or

needs. But, as Revolut has made no error, I'm not convinced any compensation would be required so it would be churlish of me to criticise Revolut.

Like our investigator, Revolut shared many pages of Mr W's chat history with them. I don't think it'd be a stretch to say that Mr W has been critical of the service he receives from Revolut on many occasions. I have to wonder if he's so unhappy with the service they provide that he continues to remain a customer when he's free to take his business elsewhere.

My final decision

For the reasons given, my final decision is not to uphold Mr W's complaint against Revolut Ltd.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr W to accept or reject my decision before 12 November 2024.

Sandra Quinn
Ombudsman