

The complaint

Mr B complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund money he lost to a scam.

A firm represents Mr B, but for ease, I have only referred to Mr B in this decision.

What happened

Mr B made the following transfers towards what he thought was a legitimate cryptocurrency investment.

Payment	Date	Type of transaction	Amount
1	24 August 2023	Faster Payment	£4,000
2	24 August 2023	Faster Payment	£21,000
3	25 August 2023	Faster Payment	£25,000
4	18 September 2023	Faster Payment	£25,000
5	19 September 2023	Faster Payment	£20,000
	21 September 2023	<i>Faster Payment - declined</i>	£19,900
	21 September 2023	<i>Faster Payment - declined</i>	£19,900
	21 September 2023	<i>Faster Payment - declined</i>	£19,900
6	23 September 2023	Faster Payment	£8,241
7	23 September 2023	Faster Payment	£4,722
8	23 September 2023	Faster Payment	£3,200
9	23 September 2023	Faster Payment	£3,737
10	25 September 2023	Faster Payment	£5,553
11	25 September 2023	Faster Payment	£6,674
	25 September 2023	<i>Faster Payment – returned</i>	<i>-£6,674</i>
12	25 September 2023	Faster Payment	£5,000
13	25 September 2023	Faster Payment	£3,026
14	25 September 2023	Faster Payment	£5,000
15	25 September 2023	Faster Payment	£3,274

Mr B's wife came across a cryptocurrency investment opportunity online and decided to invest. Mrs B's investment appeared to be growing and she later wanted to withdraw her profits from the investment. However the scammers told Mrs B she would need to pay withdrawal fees in order to do so. The payments were stopped by Mrs B's bank who also called the police.

In order to pay the fees and withdraw funds from the investment, Mrs B asked Mr B to make the payments by opening an account with Revolut. After making several payments Mr B carried out his own research into the investment firm and it was at this point he realised they had been scammed. He raised the matter with Revolut but it didn't uphold his complaint or reimburse the money he lost.

Our investigator didn't think the complaint should be upheld. While she didn't think Revolut's intervention was sufficient, she didn't think it would have been able to uncover the scam because she thought Mrs B was being coached by the scammer. Our investigator didn't think there was anything Revolut could have done to stop Mr and Mrs B making the payments.

Mr B didn't accept our investigator's opinion, as such the complaint has been passed me to decide.

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.

I recognise that I have summarised this complaint in much less detail and in my own words. I want to reassure Mr B that I have taken into account the detailed submissions from both parties in reaching my decision. However, if there's something I've not mentioned, it isn't because I've ignored it. I haven't. Rather, I've focused on setting out what is key to my decision.

I understand that Mr and Mrs B were victims of a very cruel and highly sophisticated scam and I'm sorry they lost out because of it. However, I must put aside my feelings and consider Mr B's complaint impartially. Having done so, I have reached the same outcome as our investigator and for similar reasons. I know this will come as a disappointment to him, but I'll explain my reasons why.

In broad terms, the starting position in law is that Revolut is expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make. There is no dispute that the payments were authorised by Mr B, in accordance with the Payment Services Regulations and the terms and conditions of the account, he is therefore responsible for the loss.

However taking into consideration the relevant regulatory rules and guidance, codes of practice and good industry practice, Revolut should have looked at the wider circumstances surrounding the transaction before making the payment and taken steps to keep its customer's accounts safe. Therefore, it ought to look out for payments which might indicate that its customer is at risk of financial harm due to fraud. So, I've thought about whether Revolut acted fairly and reasonably here.

Revolut intervened when Mr B made the second payment which was a transfer of £21,000. It's shown that when asked for the purpose of the payment, Mr B selected "something else". Considering, the value of the payment, it was the second payment made to a new payee within minutes of each other, and that this was a newly opened account, I think the payments ought to have raised concern and warranted intervention by Revolut.

Mr B was directed to Revolut's in-app chat to discuss the payment. Having reviewed this conversation, I don't think the agent's questions went far enough to try to ensure Mr B was not falling victim to a scam. I would expect the agent to have asked for more information to establish the payment's purpose. While the questions should not amount to interrogation, I think it would have been appropriate in the circumstance, and amongst other questions, to

have asked Mr B why he was making such a large payment, what it was for, how he knew the person the payment was going to and whether he had paid them before. Therefore, I'm not satisfied that Revolut did enough to identify a potential scam and I don't find the warning provided by the agent sufficient.

While I think Revolut could have done more here, I must also consider whether further probing would have been effective such that Revolut might have uncovered the scam. And I am not persuaded it would. I say this because, Mr B gave inaccurate answers when questioned on other payments. I'm also aware that his other bank also intervened on two occasions when he transferred funds to his Revolut account, however his answers were misleading. Mrs B has told us that on occasions she carried out the payments from Mr B's account and answered the questions in the app chat with Revolut. I have reviewed Mrs B's conversations with the scammer and I can see she was guided by them to answer Revolut's questions. She told us the scammer would at times stay on the phone while they were on the phone with the bank and guided Mrs B to answer its questions. I note on one such call Mrs B can be heard in the background assisting Mr B. So on balance, I think it more likely than not they would have sought guidance from the scammer to answer the agent's questions even if Revolut had probed further.

I find Mrs B was under the scammer's spell as she had been in conversation with them for several months and I think it is clear she had come to trust them. It's clear Mrs B had strong beliefs that the investment was genuine and I note that despite Mrs B's bank involving the police and making it clear that the investment was likely a scam, she found alternative means of making the payments. One such way was by Mr B setting up various accounts and making the payments on her behalf. And despite being aware of the intervention by the police, Mr B agreed to proceed. Mr B received warnings on subsequent payment setting out some key features of a cryptocurrency investment scam and I think it ought to have resonated with him. For example it warned of the promise of high returns with little risk, being asked to pay fees or taxes to withdraw from the investment, he was also warned about the involvement of a third-party but Mr B didn't take heed of these warnings.

Ultimately, it is for these reasons that I'm not persuaded that further questioning would have uncovered the scam, nor would Mr B have reacted positively to a more robust and detailed warnings from Revolut. Mr B said he was not initially aware of the details of the investment and he was supporting his wife, and I think it's likely he would have continued to do so.

Given that the payments were for the purchase of cryptocurrency and made to genuine sellers, before being passed on to the scammers, I am not persuaded there were any prospects of Revolut recovering Mr B's funds.

I've thought carefully about everything that's happened and I appreciate that Mr B's losses are not insignificant. I could only uphold this complaint and require Revolut to refund the payments if I thought any errors on its part would have made a material difference and I'm not persuaded that they would here. So, I cannot fairly or reasonably hold it responsible for the loss.

My final decision

For the reasons outlined above, I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr B to accept or reject my decision before 28 July 2025.

Oluwatobi Balogun

Ombudsman