

The complaint

Mrs Q is unhappy that Revolut Ltd haven't refunded money she lost as a result of a scam.

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 early 2024 Mrs Q came across a celebrity endorsed advert on social media about an investment opportunity. She put in her contact details and was cold called by someone who said they worked for a genuine crypto exchange. The individual said that Mrs Q should download a screen sharing software so that he could help her set up a crypto trading account and support her with her trading.

In January 2024 Mrs Q decided to deposit around £50,000 into her Revolut account from an account she held with a bank – I'll refer to here as 'E'. She then made four payments totalling around £40,004.36. She asked the merchant to release some of her profits and received refunds in euros during January 2024 which was approximately £14,813.69. Mrs Q realised she had been scammed when she was asked aggressively for more money so that she could withdraw the remaining account balance. She then lost contact with the merchant. In total Mrs Q's loss was around £25,226.67.

Mrs Q contacted E and Revolut to raise a claim but she was told by Revolut that it hadn't done anything wrong here so it wouldn't be providing a refund.

Our investigator felt the complaint should be upheld in part. He said that Revolut should've been suspicious of the first payment and provided a tailored warning about crypto investments that Mrs Q likely would've listened to with the scam subsequently been uncovered. He said that the money wasn't recoverable as it was paid via debit card to a crypto exchange so Mrs Q received the service she paid for and that both sides should share equal blame for the losses involved here (50%).

Mrs Q disagreed with the 50% reduction to her award. She felt this was harsh because she trusted the advertisement that was by a celebrity and on a well-known news channel. She added that she was more vulnerable to this scam because of her age, her personal medical history and personal circumstances. Mrs Q also raised her concerns about Revolut allowing scam companies to operate and its failure to stop its customers falling for these investment scams.

Revolut disagreed with the investigator as well. It said that the payments were sent on from the Revolut account to accounts in Mrs Q's name, so the loss didn't occur from this account because they were self to self. It said this service's reliance on R v FOS [2022] EWHC 710 is misconceived and amounts to a legal error because that decision was a permission decision that doesn't set a precedent like a judgment would. Revolut added that interventions by other banks (such as E here) should be considered as well and complaints made to those other institutions to share liability.

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 agree with the investigator that this complaint should be upheld in part and for largely the same reasons.

In deciding what's fair and reasonable, I'm required to take into account relevant law and regulations; regulatory rules, guidance and standards; codes of practice; and, where appropriate, what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time.

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.

Revolut has addressed an Administrative Court judgment (R vs FOS), which was referred to in a decision on a separate complaint. As I have not referred to or relied on that judgment in reaching my conclusion in relation to the losses for which I consider it fair and reasonable to hold Revolut responsible, I do not intend to comment on it. I note that Revolut says that it has not asked me to analyse how damages would be apportioned in a hypothetical civil action but, rather, it is asking me to consider all of the facts of the case before me when considering what is fair and reasonable, including the role of all the other financial institutions involved.

In broad terms, the starting position at law is that an Electronic Money Institution ("EMI") such as Revolut is expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make, in accordance with the Payment Services Regulations (in this case the 2017 regulations) and the terms and conditions of the customer's account.

And, as the Supreme Court has recently reiterated in *Philipp v Barclays Bank UK PLC*, subject to some limited exceptions banks have a contractual duty to make payments in compliance with the customer's instructions.

In that case, the Supreme Court considered the nature and extent of the contractual duties owed by banks to their customers when making payments. Among other things, it said, in summary:

- The starting position is that it is an implied term of any current account contract that, where a customer has authorised and instructed a bank to make a payment, it must carry out the instruction promptly. It is not for the bank to concern itself with the wisdom or risk of its customer's payment decisions.
- At paragraph 114 of the judgment the court noted that express terms of the current account contract may modify or alter that position. In *Philipp*, the contract permitted Barclays not to follow its consumer's instructions where it reasonably believed the payment instruction was the result of APP fraud; but the court said having the right to decline to carry out an instruction was not the same as being under a legal duty to do so.

In this case, the terms of Revolut's contract with Mrs Q modified the starting position described in *Philipp*, by – among other things – expressly requiring Revolut to refuse or

delay a payment “*if legal or regulatory requirements prevent us from making the payment or mean that we need to carry out further checks*” (Section 19).

So Revolut was required by the terms of its contract to refuse payments in certain circumstances, including to comply with regulatory requirements such as the Financial Conduct Authority’s Principle for Businesses 6, which required financial services firms to pay due regard to the interests of their customers and treat them fairly. I am satisfied that paying due regard to the interests of its customers and treating them fairly meant Revolut should have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and refused card payments in some circumstances to carry out further checks.

In practice Revolut did in some instances refuse or delay payments at the time where it suspected its customer might be at risk of falling victim to a scam.

I must also take into account that the basis on which I am required to decide complaints is broader than the simple application of contractual terms and the regulatory requirements referenced in those contractual terms. I must determine the complaint by reference to what is, in my opinion, fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of the case (DISP 3.6.1R) taking into account the considerations set out at DISP 3.6.4R.

Whilst the relevant regulations and law (including the law of contract) are both things I must take into account in deciding this complaint, I’m also obliged to take into account regulator’s guidance and standards, relevant codes of practice and, where appropriate, what I consider to have been good industry practice at the relevant time: see DISP 3.6.4R. So, in addition to taking into account the legal position created by Revolut’s standard contractual terms, I also must have regard to these other matters in reaching my decision.

Looking at what is fair and reasonable on the basis set out at DISP 3.6.4R, I consider that Revolut should in January 2024 have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and have taken additional steps, or made additional checks, before processing payments in some circumstances.

In reaching the view that Revolut should have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and have taken additional steps, or made additional checks, before processing payments in some circumstances, I am mindful that in practice all banks and EMI’s like Revolut did in fact seek to take those steps, often by:

- using algorithms to identify transactions presenting an increased risk of fraud;¹
- requiring consumers to provide additional information about the purpose of transactions during the payment authorisation process;
- using the confirmation of payee system for authorised push payments;
- providing increasingly tailored and specific automated warnings, or in some circumstances human intervention, when an increased risk of fraud is identified.

For example, it is my understanding that in January 2024, Revolut, whereby if it identified a scam risk associated with a card payment through its automated systems, could (and sometimes did) initially decline to make that payment, in order to ask some additional questions (for example through its in-app chat).

¹ For example, Revolut’s website explains it launched an automated anti-fraud system in August 2018: <https://www.revolut.com/news/revolut-unveils-new-fleet-of-machine-learning-technology-that-has-seen-a-fourfold-reduction-in-card-fraud-and-had-offers-from-banks/>

I am also mindful that:

- Electronic Money Institutions like Revolut are required to conduct their business with “due skill, care and diligence” (FCA Principle for Businesses 2), “integrity” (FCA Principle for Businesses 1) and a firm “must take reasonable care to organise and control its affairs responsibly and effectively, with adequate risk management systems” (FCA Principle for Businesses 3)².
- Over the years, the FCA, and its predecessor the FSA, have published a series of publications setting out non-exhaustive examples of good and poor practice found when reviewing measures taken by firms to counter financial crime, including various iterations of the *“Financial crime: a guide for firms”*.
- Regulated firms are required to comply with legal and regulatory anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism requirements. Those requirements include maintaining proportionate and risk-sensitive policies and procedures to identify, assess and manage money laundering risk – for example through customer due-diligence measures and the ongoing monitoring of the business relationship (including through the scrutiny of transactions undertaken throughout the course of the relationship). I do not suggest that Revolut ought to have had concerns about money laundering or financing terrorism here, but I nevertheless consider these requirements to be relevant to the consideration of Revolut’s obligation to monitor its customer’s accounts and scrutinise transactions.
- The October 2017, BSI Code³, which a number of banks and trade associations were involved in the development of, recommended firms look to identify and help prevent transactions – particularly unusual or out of character transactions – that could involve fraud or be the result of a scam. Not all firms signed the BSI Code (and Revolut was not a signatory), but the standards and expectations it referred to represented a fair articulation of what was, in my opinion, already good industry practice in October 2017 particularly around fraud prevention, and it remains a starting point for what I consider to be the minimum standards of good industry practice now (regardless of the fact the BSI was withdrawn in 2022).
- Revolut should also have been aware of the increase in multi-stage fraud, particularly involving cryptocurrency when considering the scams that its customers might become victim to. Multi-stage fraud involves money passing through more than one account under the consumer’s control before being sent to a fraudster. Our service has seen a significant increase in this type of fraud over the past few years – particularly where the immediate destination of funds is a cryptocurrency wallet held in the consumer’s own name. And, increasingly, we have seen the use of an EMI (like Revolut) as an intermediate step between a high street bank account and cryptocurrency wallet.
- The main card networks, Visa and Mastercard, don’t allow for a delay between receipt of a payment instruction and its acceptance: the card issuer has to choose straight away whether to accept or refuse the payment. They also place certain restrictions on their card issuers’ right to decline payment instructions. The essential

² Since 31 July 2023 under the FCA’s new Consumer Duty package of measures, banks and other regulated firms must act to deliver good outcomes for customers (Principle 12), but the circumstances of this complaint pre-date the Consumer Duty and so it does not apply.

³ BSI: PAS 17271: 2017” Protecting customers from financial harm as result of fraud or financial abuse”

effect of these restrictions is to prevent indiscriminate refusal of whole classes of transaction, such as by location. The network rules did not, however, prevent card issuers from declining particular payment instructions from a customer, based on a perceived risk of fraud that arose from that customer's pattern of usage. So it was open to Revolut to decline card payments where it suspected fraud, as indeed Revolut does in practice (see above).

Overall, taking into account relevant law, regulators rules and guidance, relevant codes of practice and what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time, I consider it fair and reasonable in January 2024 that Revolut should:

- have been monitoring accounts and any payments made or received to counter various risks, including preventing fraud and scams;
- have had systems in place to look out for unusual transactions or other signs that might indicate that its customers were at risk of fraud (among other things). This is particularly so given the increase in sophisticated fraud and scams in recent years, which firms are generally more familiar with than the average customer;
- in some circumstances, irrespective of the payment channel used, have taken additional steps, or made additional checks, or provided additional warnings, before processing a payment – (as in practice Revolut sometimes does); and
- have been mindful of – among other things – common scam scenarios, how the fraudulent practices are evolving (including for example the common use of multi-stage fraud by scammers, including the use of payments to cryptocurrency accounts as a step to defraud consumers) and the different risks these can present to consumers, when deciding whether to intervene.

Whilst I am required to take into account the matters set out at DISP 3.6.4R when deciding what is fair and reasonable, I am satisfied that to comply with the regulatory requirements that were in place in January 2024, Revolut should in any event have taken these steps.

Should Revolut have recognised that Mrs Q was at risk of financial harm from fraud?

It isn't in dispute that Mrs Q has fallen victim to a cruel scam here, nor that she authorised the payments she made by card to her cryptocurrency wallet (from where that cryptocurrency was subsequently transferred to the scammer).

By January 2024, when these transactions took place, firms like Revolut had been aware of the risk of multi-stage scams involving cryptocurrency for some time. Scams involving cryptocurrency have increased over time. The FCA and Action Fraud published warnings about cryptocurrency scams in mid-2018 and figures published by the latter show that losses suffered to cryptocurrency scams have continued to increase since. They reached record levels in 2022. During that time, cryptocurrency was typically allowed to be purchased through many high street banks with few restrictions.

By the end of 2022, however, many of the high street banks had taken steps to either limit their customer's ability to purchase cryptocurrency using their bank accounts or increase friction in relation to cryptocurrency related payments, owing to the elevated risk associated with such transactions. And by January 2024, when these payments took place, further restrictions were in place. This left a smaller number of payment service providers, including Revolut, that allowed customers to use their accounts to purchase cryptocurrency with few restrictions. These restrictions – and the reasons for them – would have been well known across the industry.

I recognise that, as a result of the actions of other payment service providers, many customers who wish to purchase cryptocurrency for legitimate purposes will be more likely to use the services of an EMI, such as Revolut. And I'm also mindful that a significant majority of cryptocurrency purchases made using a Revolut account will be legitimate and not related to any kind of fraud (as Revolut has told our service). However, our service has also seen numerous examples of consumers being directed by fraudsters to use Revolut accounts in order to facilitate the movement of the victim's money from their high street bank account to a cryptocurrency provider, a fact that Revolut is aware of.

So, taking into account all of the above I am satisfied that by the end of 2022, prior to the payments Mrs Q made in January 2024, Revolut ought fairly and reasonably to have recognised that its customers could be at an increased risk of fraud when using its services to purchase cryptocurrency, notwithstanding that the payment would often be made to a cryptocurrency wallet in the consumer's own name.

To be clear, I'm not suggesting as Revolut argues that, as a general principle (under the Consumer Duty or otherwise), Revolut should have more concern about payments being made to a customer's own account than those which are being made to third party payees. As I've set out in some detail above, it is the specific risk associated with cryptocurrency in January 2024 that, in some circumstances, should have caused Revolut to consider transactions to cryptocurrency providers as carrying an increased risk of fraud and the associated harm.

In those circumstances, as a matter of what I consider to have been fair and reasonable, good practice and to comply with regulatory requirements, Revolut should have had appropriate systems for making checks and delivering warnings before it processed such payments. And as I have explained Revolut was also required by the terms of its contract to refuse or delay payments where regulatory requirements meant it needed to carry out further checks. Taking all of the above into account, and in light of the increase in multi-stage fraud, particularly involving cryptocurrency, I don't think that the fact most of the payments in this case were going to an account held in Mrs Q's own name should have led Revolut to believe there wasn't a risk of fraud.

So, I've gone onto consider, taking into account what Revolut knew about the payments, at what point, if any, it ought to have identified that Mrs Q might be at a heightened risk of fraud that merited its intervention.

By the time Mrs Q sent the first payment of £4,004.67 towards this scam I think there was enough happening here that Revolut should've been suspicious. By that point Mrs Q had received £50,000 into her Revolut account and immediately sent over £4,000 to a high-risk crypto exchange. I note Mrs Q had opened the account before she was scammed and used it for genuine transactions. But given what Revolut knew about the destination of the payment and the high value, I think that the circumstances should've led Revolut to consider that Mrs Q was at heightened risk of financial harm from fraud. In line with good industry practice and regulatory requirements, I am satisfied that it is fair and reasonable to conclude that Revolut should have warned its customer before this payment went ahead.

What kind of warning should Revolut have provided?

I've thought carefully about what a proportionate warning in light of the risk presented would be in these circumstances. In doing so, I've taken into account that many payments that look very similar to this one will be entirely genuine. I've given due consideration to Revolut's duty to make payments promptly, as well as what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time this payment was made.

Taking that into account, I think Revolut ought, when Mrs Q attempted to make the first payment towards the scam, knowing that the payment was going to a cryptocurrency provider, to have provided a warning (whether automated or in some other form) that was specifically about the risk of cryptocurrency scams, given how prevalent they had become by the end of 2022. In doing so, I recognise that it would be difficult for such a warning to cover off every permutation and variation of cryptocurrency scam, without significantly losing impact.

So, at this point in time, I think that such a warning should have addressed the key risks and features of the most common cryptocurrency scams – cryptocurrency investment scams. The warning Revolut ought fairly and reasonably to have provided should have highlighted, in clear and understandable terms, the key features of common cryptocurrency investment scams, for example referring to: an advertisement on social media, promoted by a celebrity or public figure; an ‘account manager’, ‘broker’ or ‘trader’ acting on their behalf; the use of remote access software and a small initial deposit which quickly increases in value.

I recognise that a warning of that kind could not have covered off all scenarios. But I think it would have been a proportionate way for Revolut to minimise the risk of financial harm to Mrs Q by covering the key features of scams affecting many customers but not imposing a level of friction disproportionate to the risk the payment presented.

If Revolut had provided a cryptocurrency investment scam warning, would that have prevented the losses Mrs Q incurred after that point?

I’ve thought carefully about whether a specific warning covering off the key features of cryptocurrency investment scams would have likely prevented any further loss in this case. And on the balance of probabilities, I think it would have. There were several key hallmarks of common cryptocurrency investment scams present in the circumstances of Mrs Q’s payments, such as being assisted by a broker to open cryptocurrency wallets and making a small investment at first followed by larger payments.

I’ve found no persuasive evidence to suggest that Mrs Q was asked, or agreed to, disregard any warning provided by Revolut. I’ve also seen no indication that Mrs Q expressed mistrust of Revolut or financial firms in general. Neither do I think that the conversation demonstrates a closeness of relationship that Revolut would have found difficult to counter through a warning. I understand that Mrs Q did not agree to the fraudsters further demands for her to pay fees on any further withdrawals and, it was her difficulty in withdrawing her remaining money that led her to realising she had been scammed.

I’ve also considered that Mrs Q had mentioned to E and Revolut that she had been scammed before. As a result, I’m satisfied that any further detailed warnings from Revolut about this payment would’ve more than likely resonated with her.

Therefore, on the balance of probabilities, had Revolut provided Mrs Q with an impactful warning that gave details about cryptocurrency investment scams and how she could protect herself from the risk of fraud, I believe it would have resonated with her. She could have paused and looked more closely into this before proceeding, as well as making further enquiries into cryptocurrency scams. I’m satisfied that a timely warning to Mrs Q from Revolut would very likely have caused her to take the steps she did take later – revealing the scam and preventing her further losses.

Is it fair and reasonable for Revolut to be held responsible for consumer’s loss?

In reaching my decision about what is fair and reasonable, I have taken into account that Mrs Q paid money using her Revolut account to another account in her own name, rather than directly to the fraudster, so she remained in control of her money after she made the payments, and there were further steps before the money was lost to the scammer.

However, for the reasons I have set out above, I am satisfied that it would be fair to hold Revolut responsible for Mrs Q's losses from the first payment, subject to a deduction for Mrs Q's own contribution towards her loss. As I have explained, the potential for multi-stage scams, particularly those involving cryptocurrency, ought to have been well known to Revolut. And as a matter of good practice, I consider it fair and reasonable that Revolut should have been on the look-out for payments presenting an additional scam risk including those involving multi-stage scams.

But as I've set out in some detail above, I think that Revolut still should have recognised that Mrs Q might have been at risk of financial harm from fraud when they made the first payment, and in those circumstances it should have declined the payment and made further enquiries. If it had taken those steps, I am satisfied it would have prevented the losses she suffered. The fact that the money used to fund the scam came from elsewhere and/or wasn't lost at the point it was transferred to consumer's own account does not alter that fact and I think Revolut can fairly be held responsible for consumer's loss in such circumstances. I don't think there is any point of law or principle that says that a complaint should only be considered against either the firm that is the origin of the funds or the point of loss.

I've also considered that Mrs Q has only complained against Revolut. I accept that it's possible that other firms might also have missed the opportunity to intervene or failed to act fairly and reasonably in some other way, and Mrs Q could instead, or in addition, have sought to complain against those firms. But she has not chosen to do that via this service because E doesn't fall within the regulation of the Financial Conduct Authority and ultimately, I cannot compel her to. In those circumstances, I can only make an award against Revolut.

I'm also not persuaded it would be fair to reduce Mrs Q's compensation in circumstances where: she has only complained about one respondent from which they are entitled to recover their losses in full; has not complained against the other firm (and so is unlikely to recover any amounts apportioned to that firm); and where it is appropriate to hold a business such as Revolut responsible (that could have prevented the loss and is responsible for failing to do so). That isn't, to my mind, wrong in law or irrational but reflects the facts of the case and my view of the fair and reasonable position.

Ultimately, I must consider the complaint that has been referred to me (not those which haven't been or couldn't be referred to me) and for the reasons I have set out above, I am satisfied that it would be fair to hold Revolut responsible for Mrs Q's loss from the first payment (subject to a deduction for her own contribution which I will consider below).

Should Mrs Q bear any responsibility for their losses?

In considering this point, I've taken into account what the law says about contributory negligence as well as what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint. Firstly, I've considered the detailed submission from Mrs Q where she mentions her personal and physical circumstances and why that made her more vulnerable to this scam. I've also carefully considered her age at the time of the payments. But I also need to consider that this isn't the first time that Mrs Q has been scammed. Revolut would've been aware of Mrs Q's age at the time of the scam but not her medical and personal circumstances. So, I can't reasonably hold Revolut to a higher standard of care for matters it had no knowledge of.

I've decided that I think it would be fair if both sides accept the blame for the losses that have been incurred here. I have great sympathy for Mrs Q and I haven't taken what she has mentioned to this service lightly. However, for me the deciding factor here is that she has been scammed before and had a conversation with E when she made the £50,000 payment about scams. I accept this may have been generic at the time of the conversation with E, but I think Mrs S should've reasonably been more suspicious of these types of investment scams as well. I accept that her personal and medical circumstances understandably meant she listened to the scammer here. However, I don't think I can reasonably ignore the fact this has happened to her before.

As a result of the above, I believe Revolut can fairly deduct 50%, to the refund it must make here.

Could Revolut have done anything else to recover Mrs Q's money?

I've thought about whether Revolut did enough to attempt to recover the money Mrs Q lost, as there are some instances where debit card transactions can be refunded through making a chargeback claim.

A chargeback wouldn't have been successful for the debit card payments to the account in Mrs Q name at the genuine crypto exchange, as Mrs Q was able to move the money onto the scammers. So, Mrs Q duly received the service she paid for on her debit card. The money was subsequently lost from her other account when it was moved by the scammers. So, she couldn't claim that she didn't receive the goods or services paid for from her Revolut account to the crypto exchange.

As a result, I don't think Revolut have acted unreasonably by failing to pursue a chargeback claim or try and recover Mrs Q's money here.

My final decision

For the reasons given above, I uphold in part this complaint and direct Revolut Ltd to pay Mrs Q;

- 50% of £25,226.67
- 8% simple interest per year on that amount from the date of the payments to the date of settlement.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs Q to accept or reject my decision before 24 March 2025.

Mark Dobson
Ombudsman