

The complaint

Mr P's complaint is about Revolut Ltd's refusal to reimburse him money he says he lost due to a scam.

What happened

The circumstances of this complaint are well known to all parties concerned, so I will not repeat them again here in detail. However, I will provide an overview of events.

Mr P is a customer of Revolut. In short, he says he has fallen victim to a job scam. That is, fraudsters tricked him into making payments to receive income from completing various 'job tasks'. Below is a list of the payments in question (successful and otherwise):

Payment Number	Date	Time	Beneficiary	Type	Amount	Fee
1	2 August 2023	14:50	DZ	Push to card	£83	0
2	2 August 2023	16:51	DZ	Push to card	£51.49	£0.51
	3 August 2023	12:36	AY	Declined transfer	£67.37	-
3	3 August 2023	12:49	AY	Push to card	£65.90	£1.52
4	3 August 2023	13:31	DZ	Push to card	£200	£2
	5 August 2023	11:06		Declined transfer	£146.63	-
5	5 August 2023	12:10	AY	Push to card	£146.64	£3.37
6	5 August 2023	13:17	DZ	Push to card	£100	-
7	5 August 2023	14:04	DZ	Push to card	£247.52	£2.48
8	5 August 2023	16:31	DZ	Push to card	£189	£1.89
	7 August 2023	16:38	VA-I	Failed transfer	£935	-
9	7 August 2023	21:28	VA-I	Push to card	£950	0
10	23 August 2023	16:13	JR	Fund transfer	£154.13	0
11	31 August 2023	16:52	BM	Push to card	£48.87	£0.34

12	4 September 2023	12:22	CPC	Push to card	€ 38	0
13	6 September 2023	17:20	DG	Push to card	£25.05	0

Mr P disputed the above with Revolut. When it refused to reimburse him, he raised a complaint, which he also referred to our service.

One of our investigators considered the complaint and did not uphold it. As Mr P did not accept the investigator's findings, this matter has been passed to me to make a decision.

What I have 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 agree with the outcome reached by the investigator at first instance for the reasons I set out below.

But first, I would like to say at the outset that I have summarised this complaint in far less detail than the parties involved. I want to stress that no discourtesy is intended by this. If there is a submission I have not addressed, it is not because I have ignored the point. It is simply because my findings focus on what I consider to be the central issues in this complaint.

Should Revolut have recognised that Mr P was at risk of financial harm from fraud?

It is not in dispute that Mr P authorised the payment transactions in this matter. Generally, consumers are liable for payment transactions they have authorised. However, that is not the end of the story. This is because even if a payment is authorised, there are regulatory requirements and good industry practice which suggest firms – such as Revolut – should be on the look-out for unusual and out of character transactions to protect their customers from financial harm. And, if such payment transactions do arise, firms should intervene before processing them. That said, firms need to strike a balance between intervening in a customer's payment to protect them from financial harm, against the risk of unnecessarily inconveniencing or delaying a customer's legitimate transactions.

I have borne the above in mind when considering the payment transactions in this matter.

I am not persuaded that any of Mr P's payment transactions were so unusual or out of character. I say this because I do not find there were any significant aggravating factors which would have indicated that Mr P was at risk of financial harm.

Payments which triggered warnings

Although I am satisfied that the payments were not unusual or out of character – some of them did in fact trigger warnings from Revolut. I consider these below.

When Mr P attempted Payment 4, this triggered a warning from Revolut. The warning stated that the payment might be a scam; and it also asked Mr P to select the purpose of his payment. Mr P chose '*Payment for Goods and Services*', which presented a warning tailored to that. This warning may not have been tailored to the payment Mr P was actually making. However, Revolut could only provide a warning tailored to the payment purpose Mr P selected. For these reasons, I find that the warning Revolut provided here was

proportionate.

The failed transfer for £935 on 7 August 2023, triggered a warning from Revolut. The warning stated that the transfer may be a scam. For whatever reason, Mr P decided to cancel that payment. However, he proceeded to make Payment 9, which triggered another warning from Revolut. This warning once again stated that the payment might be a scam; and asked Mr P to select the purpose of it. This time, Mr P selected 'Crypto Currency'. The warning that followed may have partially been tailored to the payment Mr P was making. In any event, Mr P did not heed the warning and proceeded with his payment. For these reasons, I find that the warnings Revolut provided here were proportionate.

Job scams

There could be an argument to say that when Revolut asked Mr P for the payment purposes – Revolut should have had an option available relevant to job scams, which would have led to a tailored warning. I say this given the dates of the payments concerned. Having considered this point however, I am not persuaded, on the balance of probabilities, that it would have made a difference had a job scam purpose option been available.

I say this for the following reasons.

First, based on the evidence before me, I have not seen anything to suggest that Mr P would not have gone ahead with the payments if he had seen a job scam warning. For example, from the WhatsApp messages I have seen, it appears as if Mr P was under the spell of the fraudsters at the time of his payment transactions. There is nothing I have seen which suggests he had any concerns about the scam until it was too late.

Secondly, to assist me with considering how Mr P would have likely reacted to a job scam warning, I have reflected on how he responded to the warnings mentioned above – particularly the warning regarding the failed transfer. That warning said, amongst other things, “*This transfer may be a scam ... your transfer is **more unusual than 99.2%*** [emphasis added] *of all Revolut transfers.*” Despite this very clear and strong warning, Mr P still made Payment 9. I accept that this warning was not tailored to a job scam. However, I think it would be remiss of me, if I did not take into account how Mr P responded to that warning – when considering how he would have likely reacted to a job scam warning. To my mind, any reasonable person would have thought carefully had they seen the warning Mr P did – regardless of whether it was tailored to a job scam.

For these reasons, I am not persuaded it would have made any difference had Revolut provided a job scam payment purpose and relevant warning. That is, I find it likely that Mr P would have proceeded with his payments regardless.

Recovery of funds

There are several reasons why I find it unlikely that Revolut would have been able to recover Mr P's funds in this matter. I will speak to the primary reason here. That being the length of time between Mr P's payments, and when he first reported the scam to Revolut. The last payment transaction Mr P made was in September 2023. However, Mr P reported the scam to Revolut in December 2023. Given how much time had lapsed, I find it unlikely that there would have been any funds for Revolut to recover. Fraudsters tend to withdraw their ill-gotten gains quickly. Further, I can see that Revolut was unsuccessful in its attempts to recover the funds regarding Payment 10.

Conclusion

Taking all the above points together, I do not find that Revolut has done anything wrong in the circumstances of this complaint. Therefore, I will not be directing Revolut to do anything further.

My final decision

For the reasons set out above, my final decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr P to accept or reject my decision before 13 March 2025.

Tony Massiah
Ombudsman