

The complaint and background

Ms U complains Revolut Ltd ('Revolut') won't reimburse £5,500 that she lost when she fell victim to a cryptocurrency investment scam.

Our investigator didn't uphold the complaint. She was satisfied that Revolut ought to have been concerned when Ms U made a payment of £5,000 and ought to have made additional checks before processing it. She found Revolut did intervene and was satisfied this interaction was proportionate to the risk identified. She was also satisfied the warning Ms U was presented with ought to have resonated with her. But she wasn't convinced any further intervention from Revolut would have prevented Ms U from proceeding with the payment in light of the responses she provided when questioned which didn't suggest she was at risk of financial harm.

Our investigator also found that Ms U had an interaction with Barclays in relation to other payments lost to the scam where she wasn't truthful about the involvement of any third parties nor what she was actually doing. And had Ms U been truthful with Barclays, she was persuaded the scam would likely have been uncovered prior to the disputed transactions being made from her Revolut account. She considered that even if Revolut had intervened further, that Ms U would still have wanted to proceed with the payments such was the depths of the scammers spell she was under.

Ms U's representative disagreed. It considered there ought to have been a direct human intervention which could have uncovered the scam and prevented Ms U's losses. As such, it requested for her case to be referred to an ombudsman for a 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 done so, I agree with our investigator's conclusions and for mostly the same reasons.

It isn't in dispute that Ms U authorised the transactions in question. She is therefore presumed liable for the loss in the first instance. However, Revolut is aware, taking longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements into account, and what I consider to be good industry practice at the time, that it should have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and made additional checks before processing payments in some circumstances.

The very first payment as a result of the scam was for £500. I'm not persuaded there is anything about that payment that ought to have looked suspicious to Revolut. However, the second payment made was for substantially more, at £5,000 and I'd have expected Revolut to have intervened at this stage.

In fact Revolut did find one of Ms U's payment's suspicious as it paused the payment to make some further enquiries about it. She initially confirmed she was transferring money to

another account of hers, before confirming this was to her investment account. Ms U was presented with a sequence of tailored warning screens relating to investment scams. And following this, she was required to acknowledge Revolut had warned her the payment was suspicious, and that she understood she may not get her money back if it's a scam. The payment was also held for three hours with Revolut recommending Ms U review it before the payment is sent.

When considering Ms U's responses, I'm satisfied Revolut's actions here were proportionate to the risk presented to them. She confirmed that she was not asked to install software, the investment came from a friend or family member, she was paying to her own account and that she had checked if the company is on the FCA's register. As such, I'm not satisfied there was any reasonable cause for Revolut to suspect Ms U was at a heightened risk of financial harm, such that it should have made any further enquiries of her.

Ms U was convinced the investment was legitimate. She confirmed she had spoken to others about it who had made profits and that she'd carried out her online searches and saw no red flags. She said the processes she went through which included providing KYC documentation when signing up gave her confidence it was a legitimate company she was dealing with. She also confirmed that she had asked a friend to look into the platform who reached the same conclusion as she did – that it looked legitimate. Like our investigator, I agree that had further intervention taken place I'm not persuaded things would have played out any differently. I'm not convinced by Ms U's responses to our investigator around why she responded to Revolut in the way she did. It's evident Ms U was heavily under the scammers 'spell' such that she was willing to mislead Barclays when it questioned her about other payments that were lost to the same scam, which I can't overlook.

Whilst Ms U has undoubtedly been the victim of a cruel scam, for the reasons I've given above I don't think it'd be fair and reasonable to hold Revolut liable for what happened.

I've also thought about what Revolut did once informed that Ms U's payments had been made as the result of a scam. Ms U transferred money to an account in her name. From there, she purchased crypto assets and moved them into a wallet address of her choosing (albeit upon the scammers instructions). As such there wouldn't have been any realistic prospect of recovery for any of the disputed transactions.

My final decision

My final decision is that I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Ms U to accept or reject my decision before 26 September 2025.

Mark O'Connor
Ombudsman