

The complaint

Mrs C complains Revolut Ltd won't refund the full amount of money she lost after she fell victim to an 'authorised push payment' ("APP") scam.

What happened

Our investigator didn't uphold the complaint. Our investigator found Revolut intervened on four of the payments sent to the scammer.

Our investigator found Revolut spoke to Mrs C on a live chat and also gave her a number of warnings based on the payment purpose she selected. Our investigator also said that Mrs C didn't give accurate answers, which meant she was given incorrect warnings.

Mrs C's representative has asked for the matter to be referred to a decision. It said the payments should've flagged as high risk. So, the complaint's 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 aware that I've summarised this complaint briefly, in less detail than has been provided, and in my own words. No discourtesy is intended by this. Instead, I've focussed on what I think is the heart of the matter here. If there's something I've not mentioned, it isn't because I've ignored it. I'm satisfied I don't need to comment on every individual point or argument to be able to reach what I think is the right outcome. Our rules allow me to do this. This simply reflects the informal nature of our service as a free alternative to the courts.

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

I have reviewed Mrs C's account and the payments she made to the scam. I agree with the investigator that payment one would've looked suspicious given its value. So, intervention would've been appropriate.

Revolut did intervene on payment one, as well as three further payments. Mrs C said she was investing in cryptocurrency, and no one was guiding her, which we know wasn't true.

Having looked at the questions asked by the agent on the live chat, they were proportionate to the value of the payment and the risk identified at the time.

Given we know Mrs C wasn't being accurate with the responses she was giving to the people she spoke to, and that she continued to make payments after being told she was being scammed, I don't find any warning would've made any difference here. Around the

same time as the first payment, Mrs C was speaking to an advisor at another bank who had told her she was being scammed - but Mrs C went on to make multiple payments after.

So, in these circumstances, I'm satisfied Revolut couldn't have prevented Mrs C from losing this money to the scammer.

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 Mrs C to accept or reject my decision before 7 April 2025.

Tom Wagstaff
Ombudsman