

## **The complaint**

Mrs A complains that Revolut Ltd hasn't protected her from losing money to a scam.

## **What happened**

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties, so I won't repeat everything here. In brief summary, Mrs A has explained that in October 2023 she made a number of payments from her Revolut account for what she thought was a legitimate job opportunity.

Mrs A subsequently realised she'd been scammed and got in touch with Revolut. Ultimately, Revolut didn't reimburse Mrs A's lost funds, and Mrs A referred her complaint about Revolut to us. As our Investigator couldn't resolve the matter informally, the case has been passed to me for a decision.

## **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 decided to not uphold Mrs A's complaint for materially the same reasons as our Investigator.

First, let me say, I don't doubt Mrs A has been the victim of a scam here. She has my sympathy. Ultimately, however, Mrs A has suffered her loss because of fraudsters, and this doesn't automatically entitle her to a refund from Revolut. It would only be fair for me to tell Revolut to reimburse Mrs A her loss (or part of it) if I thought it reasonably ought to have prevented the payments (or some of them) in the first place, or Revolut unreasonably hindered recovery of the funds after the payments had been made; and if I was satisfied, overall, this was a fair and reasonable outcome.

## **Prevention**

I'm satisfied Mrs A authorised the relevant payments. Revolut would generally be expected to process payments a customer authorises it to make. And under The Payment Services Regulations and the terms and conditions of the account, Mrs A is presumed liable for the loss in the first instance, in circumstances where she authorised the payments. That said, as a matter of good industry practice Revolut should have taken proactive steps to identify and help prevent transactions – particularly sufficiently unusual or uncharacteristic transactions – that could involve fraud or be the result of a scam. However, there are many payments made by customers each day and it's not realistic or reasonable to expect Revolut to stop and check every payment instruction. There's a balance to be struck between identifying payments that could potentially be fraudulent, and minimising disruption to legitimate payments (allowing customers ready access to their funds).

In this case, Revolut has presented information showing it did intervene in some of Mrs A's payments. For example, it's said that when setting up the new beneficiaries, Mrs A would have been shown in-app warnings which said, *"Do you know and trust this payee? If you're*

*unsure, don't pay them, as we may not be able to help get your money back. Remember, fraudsters can impersonate others, and we will never ask you to make a payment".* I understand that before processing a couple of the payments, Revolut also asked Mrs A some questions about the payments, and Mrs A said she wasn't being assisted through the questions by someone else, that she was paying a family member or friend, and the bank details were provided to her face-to-face.

Given the payments in question here, I agree with our Investigator that I would expect Revolut's intervention to have gone further than it did. However, I also agree with our Investigator in that I don't think any proportionate intervention by Revolut would most likely have prevented Mrs A's loss.

I say this because Mrs A appears to have been under the spell of the scam and was being coach extensively by the scammer. By her own admission, she found the scam convincing and had previously been told by her partner not to proceed with it. I've also listened to an intervention call Mrs A had with a third party bank, which called her about a transaction from this other account of hers, and this call also doesn't make me change my mind about this. I'm not persuaded, if Revolut had better questioned and warned her, that this likely would have changed what happened: I think most likely Mrs A would have reverted to the scammer on how to answer or in any event would have chosen to proceed with the payments anyway. This means I can't fairly say Revolut unreasonably failed to prevent the payments.

### Recovery

Most of Mrs A's payments were made to a legitimate crypto exchange by debit card, and the only potential avenue to recover these, after they were made, would have been via the chargeback scheme. However, the merchant here, for chargeback purposes, would be the crypto exchange (and not the scammers). The crypto exchange would have legitimately provided the services intended (transferring Mrs A's money into crypto for her). The subsequent transfer of the cryptocurrency onto the scammers would not give rise to a valid chargeback claim through Revolut. So I don't think these payments were reasonably recoverable through Revolut after they'd been made.

And with regards to the transfers Mrs A made at the later stages of the scam, I've seen information that Revolut tried to recover these funds, but ultimately was unable to. Bearing in mind the circumstances of this case, as explained by our Investigator, unfortunately I don't find this surprising in this case and I've seen nothing that persuades me Revolut unreasonably hindered recovery of the funds or that they could fairly be regarded as the proximate cause for why Mrs A lost this money.

I'm sorry Mrs A was scammed and lost this money. However, despite my natural sympathy, I can't fairly tell Revolut to reimburse her in circumstances where I'm not persuaded it reasonably ought to have prevented the payments or to have recovered them.

### **My final decision**

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

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs A to accept or reject my decision before 17 March 2025.

Neil Bridge  
**Ombudsman**