

## **The complaint**

Mr M is unhappy that Revolut Ltd haven't refunded money he lost as a result of a scam.

Mr M is being represented by a claims management company but, for ease of reading, I'll only refer to Mr M in the decision.

## **What happened**

The detailed background to this complaint is well known to both parties. So, I'll only provide a brief overview of some of the key events here.

In September 2023 Mr M was looking for work and received a message from a third-party offering him work online to complete job tasks in exchange for commission. Mr M contacted the representative and was told about a merchant offering such a role. Mr M was told that he could use his Revolut account to send money to the merchant via crypto exchanges and third-party individuals. In total he sent around £9,745. However, after repeatedly being told to add further funds to his account with the merchant, he realised he had been scammed. So, he contacted Revolut to make a claim.

Revolut considered the claim but said it wouldn't be offering a refund. Unhappy with that response Mr M brought his complaint to the Financial Ombudsman.

Our Investigator didn't think the complaint should be upheld. She said that Revolut reasonably intervened and asked Mr M for payment reasons, but he didn't provide accurate reasons for the payments (Investment and paying friends and family). So, she didn't think Revolut could've reasonably uncovered the scam or recovered Mr M's money here.

Mr M disagreed and asked for an Ombudsman's review. He said Revolut should've gone further here and provided a human intervention which would've more than likely uncovered the scam.

## **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 conclusion as our Investigator. And for largely the same reasons. I'm sorry to hear that Mr M has been the victim of a cruel scam. I know he feels strongly about this complaint, and this will come as a disappointment to him, so I'll explain why.

I've read and considered the whole file. But I'll concentrate my comments on what I think is relevant. If I don't mention any specific point, it's not because I've failed to take it on board and think about it, but because I don't think I need to comment on it to reach what I think is a fair and reasonable outcome.

Where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive, or contradictory (as it is here), I have to make my decision on the balance of probabilities – that is, what I consider is more likely than not to have happened in the light of the available evidence and the wider surrounding circumstances.

It is common ground that Mr M authorised the scam payments totalling around £9,745. I accept that these were authorised payments even though Mr M was the victim of a scam. So, although it wasn't his intention to pay money to the scammers, under the Payment Services Regulations 2017 (PSRs) and the terms of his account, Mr M is presumed liable for the loss in the first instance.

However, taking into account the law, regulatory rules and guidance, relevant codes of practice and good industry practice, there are circumstances where it might be appropriate for Revolut to take additional steps or make additional checks before processing a payment in order to help protect customers from the possibility of financial harm from fraud.

Revolut's first obligation is to follow the instructions that Mr M provides. But if those instructions are sufficiently unusual or uncharacteristic for the account, I'd expect Revolut to intervene and to ask their customer more about the intended transaction before processing it. I'd also expect Revolut to provide suitable warnings about common scams to help their customers make an informed decision as to whether to continue with the payment. There might also be cases where it's appropriate for Revolut to refuse to follow the instruction if there are good grounds to believe it is being made as a result of a fraud or scam.

I've considered whether Revolut could've done more here and whether this would've more than likely uncovered the scam. Having done so, I'm not persuaded it reasonably could've.

Revolut asked for payment reasons from Mr M at the time and he selected that he was sending money for '*Investments*' and '*friends and family*'. It then asked some further follow up questions of Mr M to try and understand the reason he was sending the money. But Mr M continued to respond to Revolut's questions with answers such as finding the investment opportunity through a family member or friend and that he had checked to see whether the firm was regulated. He also responded to further questions in relation to friends and family to say that he was paying back a friend for something they had purchased on his behalf and he had received the account details face to face. So, it wasn't just the initial payment reason where he was providing inaccurate information. It was also the follow up questions. As a result of his responses, Revolut provided warnings relevant to crypto investment scams and friends and family. But because this was a job scam the warnings didn't resonate with Mr M at the time.

If Mr M had selected 'something else' he would've been able to see an option to select '*As part of a job opportunity*'. And this would've enabled Revolut to provide more accurate warnings in relation to the scam that Mr M was involved with. But because of the payment reasons and responses he provided this stopped Revolut from providing more relevant scam information.

Mr M has argued Revolut should've done more here by providing a human intervention. But I don't agree. The amounts and the time span that they were made in weren't, in my opinion, of a significantly high value and frequency in general banking terms to have given Revolut further concern given the payment reasons and the previous answers Mr M had provided.

Taking all this into account, I don't think any of the circumstances surrounding the scam payments would've given Revolut any obvious cause for concern so that it needed to reasonably take further action here; and that it took reasonable and proportionate action before processing them.

Revolut attempted to recover the money that Mr M had sent to the beneficiary accounts, but it has provided evidence that the funds weren't recoverable.

I have a great deal of sympathy for Mr M and the loss he's suffered. But it would only be fair for me to direct Revolut to refund his loss if I thought it was responsible – and I'm not persuaded that this was the case. For the above reasons, I think Revolut has acted fairly and so I'm not going to tell it to do anything further.

### **My final decision**

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 M to accept or reject my decision before 5 August 2025.

Mark Dobson  
**Ombudsman**