

## **The complaint**

Mr T complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund the money he lost when he was the victim of a scam.

## **What happened**

In September 2023, Mr T saw an advert online about a potential job working from home. And as he was taking time off from his existing job, he entered his details and was then contacted by someone who explained the job involved generating sales data to help online stores increase their sales.

Mr T was given access to a platform where he could see the tasks he could complete and the money he had earned. And he was shown how to purchase cryptocurrency, which he would use to pay for some of the tasks he was to complete. He then made a number of payments from his Revolut account to purchase cryptocurrency, which she then sent on to wallet details he was given for the job platform.

Unfortunately, we now know the job was a scam. The scam was uncovered after Mr T was told he needed to pay increasingly large amounts of money before he could withdraw the money the platform said he had made. Mr T then realised he had been the victim of a scam and reported the payments he had made to Revolut.

Revolut investigated but said it had fulfilled its duty to him by providing sufficient scam warnings and wasn't at fault for processing the payments he had authorised. So it didn't agree to refund the money he had lost. Mr T wasn't satisfied with Revolut's response, so referred a complaint to our service.

One of our investigators looked at the complaint. They didn't think anything we would have expected Revolut to have done would have prevented Mr T making the payments or losing the money he did. So they didn't think Revolut should have to refund any of the money Mr T had lost. Mr T disagreed with our investigator, so the complaint has been passed to me.

## **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.

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.

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 that in September 2023 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;
- have acted to avoid causing foreseeable harm to customers, for example by maintaining adequate systems to detect and prevent scams and by ensuring all aspects of its products, including the contractual terms, enabled it to do so;
- 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 including in relation to card payments);
- 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.

But, even if Revolut had recognised that Mr T was at heightened risk of financial harm from fraud when making some of these payments, I don't think the action I would have expected it to take would have prevented his loss. I'll explain why below.

I'm satisfied Revolut ought to have recognised that Mr T was at heightened risk of financial harm from fraud by at least the point he tried to make the eighth payment here. At this point he had tried to make eight payments in around two hours, to three new payees he'd never paid before, and all for similar amounts– which is a pattern of behaviour often seen when customers are falling victim to a scam.

I think a proportionate response to the risk I think Revolut should have identified would have been for it to ask Mr T a series of questions in order to try to establish the circumstances surrounding the payments and the actual scam risk, and then to provide him with a written warning relevant to that risk. But, had it done this, I'm not persuaded that it would have prevented Mr T's loss.

Revolut did intervene when Mr T made a number of the payments here. On several occasions it asked him to select the purpose of the payment he was making from a list of options. And, each time, Mr T selected that he was paying a family member or friend – despite this not being an accurate explanation of the circumstances surrounding the payments.

Another bank Mr T moved money into his Revolut account from before making the payments towards the scam also contacted him to ask about the payments. It asked him why he was making the payments to his Revolut account, and Mr T answered that it was for savings and investments. The other bank then asked him what kind of investment he was doing from the Revolut account, and Mr T answered that he didn't know what he would use the money on yet but is just moving it to that account so he has it available when something comes up.

The other bank then explains that it is seeing a large number of scams where people are contacted and offered the chance to invest or make money and offered high interest rates. It

asks whether anything like that has happened prior to Mr T making the payment, and he answers that it has not. Mr T is also asked whether he has been told to move money for any reason other than they have discussed or been told to come up with a story or lie to the other bank about the payment, and answers that he has not.

A third bank Mr T tried to make payments from during this scam has also confirmed that it blocked his account and had a discussion with him, after which it was concerned he was the victim of a scam. But Mr T assured it he was not the victim of a scam, and continued to attempt payments towards the scam from his other accounts following this.

So even if Revolut had asked more questions to establish the scam risk when Mr T made the payments here, I think it's likely he wouldn't have given it accurate information about the purpose of the payment or the circumstances surrounding it – as happened with the questions he was asked by both Revolut and the other bank. And so I don't think Revolut would have had significant concerns following its questions and I don't think any warning I would have expected it to show following those questions would have stopped Mr T from making the payments or losing the money he did – as the warnings he was given by Revolut and the other banks did not.

Mr T has argued that the interventions both Revolut and the other bank carried out didn't go far enough to address the risks they should have identified and aren't sufficient to conclude that a better intervention from Revolut wouldn't have prevented the scam. He's said that a better intervention from Revolut, asking open and probing questions and scrutinising any answers he gave, would have uncovered the scam and prevented his loss.

But while I agree that Revolut's intervention wasn't a proportionate response to the risk I think it should have identified, I wouldn't have expected its intervention to go as far as Mr T has suggested. The payments here were all of relatively low value and, apart from the pattern of behaviour I explained above, there wasn't anything else about them that I think should have caused Revolut significant concern.

So while I'd have expected Revolut to intervene, I think questions to establish the circumstances surrounding the payments and then a written warning about that risk would have been proportionate, and I wouldn't have expected it to carry out the kind of probing and in-depth questioning Mr T has described. And, for the same reasons I explained above, I don't think the kind of intervention I would have expected would have stopped Mr T from making the payments or losing the money he did.

I appreciate that Mr T has been the victim of a cruel scam and that my decision will come as a disappointment to him. He has lost a significant amount of money and I sympathise with the position he has found himself in. But I can only look at Revolut's responsibilities and, for the reasons I've set out above, I don't think anything I would reasonably have expected Revolut to have done would have prevented the loss he suffered.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons set out above, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr T to accept or reject my decision before 17 October 2025.

Alan Millward  
**Ombudsman**