

The complaint

Mr A says Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) refuses to refund him for transactions on his account he says were unauthorised.

What happened

Mr A says £8,430.35 was taken from his Revolut account in three transactions between 17 April and 19 April 2023 by an unknown third party. Mr A complained to Revolut and said it should refund these transactions.

Revolut says the card transactions in dispute were carried on Mr A’s trusted device and verified by one-time passcode (OTP) which was sent to Mr A’s phone number. So, it believes Mr A is responsible for these transactions, and it hasn’t refunded any of the money.

Our investigator considered this complaint and decided not to uphold it. Ultimately, he was persuaded by the evidence provided that it is more likely than not that Mr A authorised all the transactions in dispute. Mr A wasn’t happy with this outcome, so the complaint has been passed to me for a final 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.

Generally speaking, Revolut is required to refund any unauthorised payments made from Mr A’s account. Those rules are set out in the Payment Service Regulations 2017. Mr A has said he didn’t carry out the transactions in dispute, but Revolut says it thinks he did. So, I must give my view on whether I think Mr A authorised the transactions or not.

Revolut has provided evidence to show the transactions in dispute were card payments to cryptocurrency accounts. These were completed using Mr A’s card details on his trusted device. The evidence shows this device is a Samsung tablet which was registered on the account on 2 March 2023 and has been used for authorised transactions in the past. Mr A has confirmed that he has a Samsung tablet which he has used to access his Revolut account previously. He lives alone and no one else has the passcode to his app.

Revolut has also shown us that the transactions passed an additional verification step via a one-time passcode. The transactions were only completed after the correct passcode was entered. Again, Mr A says no one else has access to his Revolut passcode and he lives alone. So, it seems likely that Mr A completed the transactions himself on this known device.

I’ve considered what Mr A and his representative have said about the remote access apps being installed on Mr A’s devices, which is what led to previous fraud on his account. It is possible then that someone else had access to the information on his device, but it doesn’t explain how someone else would’ve have the passcode to log into his Revolut app. Also, Revolut has shown us that Mr A sent a selfie of himself along with a picture of his driving licence just before the first card payment was made. I’ve looked at the transactions on

Mr A's account and I've seen a top up to Mr A's account during the transactions in dispute, which provided the funds for the second transaction. Mr A hasn't disputed this payment, so it would seem he was funding the later transactions he was planning to make. So, considering all this evidence together I think it's likely these transactions were carried out by Mr A.

In their response to our initial outcome Mr A's representative raised the argument that Revolut should've done more to protect Mr A's account from fraud, as he had just fallen victim to a scam. I have considered whether it would be fair to have expected Revolut to have intervened here, but I don't think it would be and I'll explain why.

Before the disputed card transactions on Mr A's account a cryptocurrency exchange was attempted. And before this was authorised Mr A was required to send Revolut a selfie of himself with his driving licence ID. Mr A completed this request, so Revolut was satisfied he was the one logged onto the account and making the transactions. The OTP sent to Mr A's phone also included a scam warning, informing Mr A that the code should not be shared with anyone else. Following Mr A's recent scam incident Revolut provided some education on how to protect your account from further fraud. It was then Mr A's responsibility to read and absorb this information, and to protect his account and security information. So, I don't think Revolut should've done anything more than it should have in this case.

My final decision

I am not upholding this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr A to accept or reject my decision before 21 November 2024.

Sienna Mahboobani
Ombudsman