

## **The complaint**

Mr M complains that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) didn’t do enough to protect him when he fell victim to a scam.

## **What happened**

In summary, believing he was investing in cryptocurrency, Mr M made payments of approximately £90,000 to a scammer in September and October 2023. But he later realised he’d fallen victim to a scam and complained to Revolut.

Once Revolut had been made aware of the scam, it made attempts to recover Mr M’s funds and successfully recovered a small portion. But it didn’t uphold Mr M’s complaint and therefore wasn’t willing to reimburse him for his remaining losses. It said it had provided sufficient scam warnings and had done everything in its power to recover the funds.

Unhappy with this, Mr M brought his complaint to our Service. Our investigator didn’t uphold the complaint. He agreed that Revolut should have intervened with the disputed payments but noted that it had, by way of written warnings, automated questions and through Revolut’s in-app chat function. But he said that Mr M had given misleading answers. And he didn’t think that further action from Revolut would have unravelled the scam, given that Mr M hadn’t been providing accurate information.

Mr M disagreed. He didn’t feel that Revolut had intervened sufficiently. And he said he’d been persuaded that the funds he was paying were for the purpose of financing his own holidays and home improvements which he reflected in the questions Revolut asked. He also provided details to emphasise his vulnerability at the time of the scam.

Another investigator reviewed the complaint and this new information. But he also didn’t uphold the complaint. He was satisfied Revolut had identified a fraud risk and had asked questions as a result, but that the answers presented suggested that the transfers were legitimate.

Mr M remained unhappy with this. He believes that if Revolut had told him he was falling victim to a scam, he would have listened. And he maintains that he was honest throughout. So, 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.

I’m sorry that Mr M has been the victim of such a cruel scam. I’ve carefully taken his circumstances into consideration – and I’m grateful for the additional information he’s provided here. But, having done so, I’m not upholding this complaint. I appreciate how disappointing this will be for Mr M. But I’ll explain below how I’ve reached this decision.

I've taken into account longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements, and what I consider to be good industry practice. I agree Revolut ought to have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and made additional checks before processing some of Mr M's payments.

Revolut said that it provided a general warning ahead of each of the disputed payments made. And I've been provided with a copy of the series of questions and answers for each individual payment. For the first payment, Mr M answered to indicate that he wasn't being assisted through the questionnaire, said he hadn't been asked to install any software, and that he hadn't been told to ignore warnings. He gave the reason for the payment as '*Something else*'. And this led to him being directed through to Revolut's in-app chat function.

Here, Mr M was asked the purpose of the transaction to which he responded, "*It's personal*". While I think Revolut could have and should have probed more at this point, I'm not persuaded that he would have given accurate information if he'd been asked more questions. I say this in part due to the brevity of his responses, but also because it appears that he'd given an inaccurate response when asked if he'd been asked to install any software. And he hadn't selected the more fitting option of '*As part of an investment*' for the payment reason. So, it appears Mr M was saying what he needed to say to get the payments processed, likely under the direction of the scammer.

I can see in later transactions that Mr M indicated, when asked, that he was buying something from social media and that this related to '*Rent, accommodation, hotel or holidays*'. From here, Revolut asked "*Is the price cheaper than usual? Scam victims are enticed into buying or renting services or products for "unrealistic prices"*" to which Mr M selected the response "*No, it's averagely priced or more expensive than usual*" as well as indicating he'd checked online reviews and seen documentation relating to proof of ownership.

When referred to the live chat function again, Revolut advised Mr M that this appeared to be a high-risk transaction and gave a warning about purchasing items or services through marketplace adverts. Mr M said he wanted to proceed with the payment.

Mr M has provided an explanation around why he selected the '*Rent...*' option. He'd intended to use funds gained from the purported investment for the purpose of holidays and house renovations. The questions were asked ahead of each payment being processed. So, I think it should have been apparent that Revolut was trying to establish what Mr M believed that specific payment was being used for, as opposed to what Mr M had intended to use any eventual profits for. I note the first question each time said "*If you're being scammed, the fraudster may ask you to hide the real reason for this payment*" which required the response "*I understand*" to proceed.

So, taking all of this into account, I think Revolut asked appropriate and proportionate questions for the majority of the payments. On occasion, such as the first payment which I've outlined above, I think it could have gone further. But I don't think that further intervention would have prevented Mr M from making payments. I say this because it's clear from the options he selected and the answers he gave, that he intended for these payments to be processed and that he trusted the scammer and that this investment was genuine.

Mr M has said that if he'd been told he was the victim of a scam, he would have listened. It's important to bear in mind here that neither party *knew* Mr M had fallen victim to a scam, particularly when factoring in the answers Mr M gave. He provided no reference to cryptocurrency or an investment, and the payments weren't identifiably being made towards cryptocurrency as they were all made to individuals. But, when advised that this was *likely* a

scam, Mr M still proceeded – Mr M was asked to write “*Revolut has warned me that this is likely a scam, and are unlikely to recover funds if I proceed with this transaction*”, which he did.

Given all of this, I accept Mr M has fallen victim to a cruel and sophisticated scam. And I acknowledge Mr M’s personal circumstances and the impact these might have had on his decision making. But I don’t think it would be fair or reasonable to hold Revolut liable – it intervened with every payment, to varying degrees, and was provided with assurances from Mr M on each occasion that he was happy to proceed. I can only uphold Mr M’s complaint if I’m satisfied that any failings on Revolut’s part made a material difference to what happened. But, for the reasons given, I’m not persuaded they would have.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons given above, I don’t uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I’m required to ask Mr M to accept or reject my decision before 6 March 2025.

Melanie Roberts  
**Ombudsman**