

## The complaint

Mr R has complained that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) failed to refund the money he lost as part of a scam.

## What happened

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties, so I will not repeat everything again here. Instead, I will focus on giving the reasons for my provisional decision.

In summary though, my understanding is that Mr R met someone on a dating app that I will call C. After a period of time C said that she invested in a company that I will call B. C said that she made large profits investing in B.

Mr R then made a number of transactions in 2023 and 2024 to B from three different current account providers, including three transactions from his Revolut account. These were £1,000 on 26 June 2023, £3,500 on 2 July 2023 and £3,000 on 15 July 2023.

Mr R realised he had been scammed when he was unable to withdraw the profits that he was led to believe he’d made. Mr R asked Revolut to refund these payments, as he believes Revolut should have done more to prevent him from being scammed in the first place. Revolut did not agree with this.

I issued a provisional decision on 29 August 2025 in which I said the following;

*“I’ve considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what’s fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.*

*In deciding what’s fair and reasonable, I am required to take into account relevant law and regulations, regulators’ rules, guidance and standards, and codes of practice; and, where appropriate, I must also take into account what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time.*

*Where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive or contradictory (as some of it is here), I reach my decision on the balance of probabilities – in other words, on what I consider is more likely to have (or would have) happened, in light of the available evidence and the wider circumstances.*

*It isn’t in dispute that Mr R authorised the payments he made from his Revolut account. The payments were requested by him using his legitimate security credentials provided by Revolut. The starting position is that Revolut ought to follow the instructions given by their customers, in order for legitimate payments to be made as instructed.*

*However, I’ve considered whether Revolut should have done more to prevent Mr R from falling victim to the scam, as there are some situations in which it should reasonably have had a closer look at the circumstances surrounding a particular transaction. For example, if it was particularly out of character.*

*The first transaction was not individually large enough for me to say that Revolut should have intervened. That said, payment 2 and 3 should have prompted an intervention given their size and that the payments were being sent to a website associated with crypto currency. So I think that Revolut should have been aware that Mr R was potentially at risk and I think it should have intervened.*

*However, had Revolut done so, I'm not persuaded it would've prevented Mr R from losing his funds. I say this because, as far as I can tell from the information I have been provided with, Mr R was not actually being scammed yet and he did not meet the scammer until some months after he made the above mentioned payments. At this point he was sending funds to a crypto exchange to buy crypto for himself. He held the funds in his crypto wallet for months and only sent the funds to the scam platform when he met the scammer in January 2024. This means that, even if Revolut had asked questions about the payments, it would only have found out that Mr R was purchasing crypto for his own purposes. Also, no warnings would have resonated with Mr R at that time, because he had yet been introduced to the scam, so any warning issued would not have been relevant to his situation at the time. So I don't think that Revolut could have intervened during the transactions in a way that would have stopped the scam that took place some months later.*

*In any event, given the delay between the funds leaving Revolut and the scam actually starting, even if I did think that Revolut had done anything wrong I could not reasonably ask it to refund the payments in question. I say this because the loss was not reasonably foreseeable as there was no way that Revolut would be expected to know that six months or so after the transactions in question Mr R would be scammed. This breaks the chain of causation. So I can't reasonably ask Revolut to refund the transactions in question.*

*Finally, I've also thought about whether Revolut could have done more to recover the funds after Mr R reported the fraud.*

*Revolut are under no obligation to refund the money to Mr R under the Contingent Reimbursement Model (CRM) Code. This is because the Code does not apply to transfers which the payer has effectively made to themselves and additionally Revolut are not part of the code either. I also don't think that Revolut could have recovered the payments via any other means either.*

*So I'm currently not persuaded that Revolut can fairly or reasonably be held liable for Mr R's loss in these circumstances."*

Neither party added any new additional points in response to my provisional 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.

Having reviewed everything, as neither party has provided any new information, I see no reason to reach a different outcome to the one I reached in my provisional decision.

So, in summary, I don't think that Revolut could have stopped the scam for the reasons set out in my provisional decision.

So for the reasons set out above and in my provisional decision I do not uphold this complaint.

**My final decision**

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

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr R to accept or reject my decision before 17 October 2025.

Charlie Newton  
**Ombudsman**