

## The complaint

Mr Z complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund money he lost as a result of a scam.

Mr Z is represented, but for ease, I have referred to comments made by his representative as though Mr Z himself made them.

## What happened

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties, so I won't repeat them all again here.

The transactions that are relevant to this complaint are as follows:

| Payment | Date                   | Time         | Type of transaction                   | Amount                     |
|---------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1       | 22 October 2023        | 16:36        | Debit card payment to crypto exchange | £12                        |
| 2       | 22 October 2023        | 17:10        | Debit card payment to crypto exchange | £9.89                      |
| 3       | 24 October 2023        | 14:28        | Debit card payment to crypto exchange | £55                        |
|         | <b>24 October 2023</b> | <b>17:08</b> | <b>Payment received</b>               | <b>£190</b>                |
| 4       | 26 October 2023        | 17:52        | Debit card payment to crypto exchange | £405                       |
| 5       | 26 October 2023        | 20:24        | Push-to-card payment                  | £783                       |
| 6       | 27 October 2023        | 10:26        | Push-to-card payment                  | £797.94 (Inc £17.94 fee)   |
| 7       | 27 October 2023        | 10:40        | Push-to-card payment                  | £20.46 (Inc £0.46 fee)     |
| 8       | 27 October 2023        | 15:18        | Push-to-card payment                  | £3,069 (Inc £69 fee)       |
| 9       | 27 October 2023        | 15:38        | Push-to-card payment                  | £1,432.20 (Inc £32.20 fee) |
| 10      | 31 October 2023        | 08:43        | Push-to-card payment                  | £285.42 (Inc £6.42 fee)    |

In summary, Mr Z said he was sent a message by someone who claimed to be a recruiter offering a job opportunity. The role was to complete tasks in order to boost application ratings in exchange for pay. Mr Z said he was required to make payments to unlock better rewards and more tasks. He realised he had been scammed when he could no longer afford the fees and he was asked to borrow money from friends and family. He also said he was treated in an aggressive manner by the scammers at this time. Mr Z complained to Revolut but it did not uphold his complaint.

Our investigator didn't think the complaint should be upheld. She said Mr Z had not provided Revolut with the real reason for the payments, and the warnings it gave were based on his answers. Our investigator concluded that the intervention and warnings were proportionate.

to the value and risk the payments presented.

Mr Z didn't accept what our investigator said and says Revolut should not have taken what he said at face value. He thinks stronger intervention was required.

As an agreement could not be reached, the complaint has been passed to 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.

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 Mr Z, but I'll explain my reasons why.

In broad terms, the starting position in law is that an electronic money institution such as Revolut is expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make. As the payments were authorised by Mr Z, 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 transactions before making the payments 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.

That said, it is not reasonable to expect the bank to stop and check every payment instruction to try to prevent fraud or financial harm. There's a balance to be struck between the extent it intervenes in payments to protect customers, and not unnecessarily disrupting legitimate payment instructions.

While payments 1 to 4 could be identified as cryptocurrency related purchases, I don't find the value of these payment significant enough to trigger Revolut's fraud prevention systems. And the method of payment used for the subsequent transactions (two of which appear to have been sent to an account in Mr Z's name) meant they don't appear as cryptocurrency payments. So I can't reasonably expect Revolut to have been aware that the payments related to cryptocurrency or to have been concerned that Mr Z might be at a heightened risk of financial harm from fraud and to have intervened.

Nevertheless, Revolut did intervene when Mr Z attempted to make the fifth payment and again before processing the eighth payment. On both occasions when asked for the payment's purpose, Mr Z stated that he was paying a friend or family member back for something they had purchased for him. Mr Z also confirmed that he was not being assisted in answering the questions, and he had been provided the recipient's account details face to face which was not the case.

I find the general warnings Revolut provided reasonable intervention in the circumstances and proportionate to the risk concerns it had. I appreciate that Mr Z wasn't aware he was being scammed and was guided by the scammers to answer the questions in the way he did. However where it has not been provided with accurate information, I can't reasonably expect Revolut to have identified that Mr Z was at risk of a job-related scam and to have provided warnings covering the key features of this type of scam.

Considering the value of the payments and what Revolut knew about the circumstances

surrounding them, I don't think they were concerning enough to warrant further intervention (e.g. directing Mr Z to discuss the payment with a member of staff).

Even if Revolut had intervened further and asked more detailed questions (which I don't think it needed to), I'm not persuaded that it would have been able to uncover the scam and prevent Mr Z's losses. I think its evident from their conversations that Mr Z was under the scammer's influence and reliant on them when making the payments. Mr Z sent screenshots to the scammer and was instructed by them throughout the payment process. I also note that Mr Z also gave inaccurate information to his external bank when it questioned him about the transfer of funds to his Revolut account. So I think it is likely Mr Z would have continued to follow the scammer's guidance if probed further by the bank.

Considering that several of the payments were made to an account in Mr Z's name and under his control, and to legitimate cryptocurrency merchants, furthermore as payments 5 to 10 were push to card payments I'm not persuaded there were any prospects of recovering the money he lost.

I've thought carefully about everything that's happened here and I appreciate that Mr Z has been a victim of a cruel scam and lost a large amount of his money here, and I sympathise with him. But I must put aside my feelings and consider the matter impartially. Having done so, I cannot fairly or reasonably hold Revolut responsible for Mr Z's losses.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons outlined 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 Z to accept or reject my decision before 21 July 2025.

Oluwatobi Balogun  
**Ombudsman**