

The complaint

Mrs D complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund the full amount of money she says lost to a scam.

What happened

The background to this complaint is well-known to both parties, so I won't repeat it in detail here. But in summary and based on the submissions of both parties, I understand it to be as follows.

Mrs D complains that she sent several payments from her account held with Revolut to what she believed was a legitimate investment. Mrs D moved money from an account she held with another bank, to Revolut and then on to Cryptocurrency platforms.

When Mrs D was asked to make more payments to withdraw her profits, she realised she had been scammed. So, she logged a complaint with Revolut.

Revolut looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. So, Mrs D brought her complaint to our service.

Our investigator looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. Our investigator found Mrs D's other bank had intervened and Mrs D had hidden the true purpose of the payments. He also found that Mrs D had not been accurate with her responses to several of the other questions she had been asked. Based on this, he didn't think Revolut could have prevented Mrs D from making the payments to the scam.

As Mrs D remained unhappy, 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 very 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 significant part here. If there's something I've not mentioned, it isn't because I've ignored it. I haven't. 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.

Where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive, or contradictory, I must make my decision on the balance of probabilities – that is, what I consider is more likely than not to have happened in the light of the available evidence and the wider surrounding circumstances.

In line with the Payment Services Regulations (PSR) 2017, consumers are generally liable for payments they authorise. Revolut is expected to process authorised payment instructions without undue delay. As an Electronic Money Institution (EMI), it also has long-standing

obligations to help protect customers from financial harm from fraud and scams.

In the circumstances of the payments Mrs D made to the scam, I agree with the investigator that payment one ought to have concerned Revolut due to its value. I also agree that a proportionate intervention would have been an automated series of questions to get a better understanding on the payment purpose. Here though, I don't think it would have stopped Mrs D sending the payments. I'll explain why.

Mrs D was asked several times for the payment purpose and she didn't give accurate responses. Instead of choosing investment, she selected other options. Mrs D was also asked to disclose some details about the payment, including whether she had downloaded any screen sharing software. Mrs D again didn't answer accurately and this hindered Revolut's ability to display appropriate warnings.

It's worth noting that the value of the payments Mrs D sent did increase significantly and I'm satisfied Revolut should have intervened again and taken Mrs D into its chat function. However, had it done so, much like the above, I'm still not satisfied it would have uncovered the scam.

The reason I say this is because Mrs D was questioned several times by the bank where the payments originated. Here she said the payments were for house renovations and used this payment purpose multiple times. Having read through the conversation Mrs D had with the scammer, it's clear why Mrs D was giving inaccurate responses to the questions she was being asked, as she was sharing the security processes with the scammer and being coached on how to answer.

The payments Mrs D made from her Revolut account were identifiably going to Cryptocurrency providers, so I'm satisfied Mrs D couldn't have used the same story had someone from Revolut questioned her in more detail. I am convinced she would have shared the questions she was being asked with the scammer as she had done previously, and most likely given a different but plausible cover story.

When thinking about later intervention, I do need to consider if the evidence suggests it was likely Mrs D would have decided to be more accurate with her responses. Given Mrs D seems to have been under the spell of the scammer up until the last payment she made, I'm not convinced the accuracy of her answers would have changed in these circumstances.

Mrs D has said that when she selected safe account, this ought to have highlighted to Revolut that she was being scammed. I've thought about this point carefully, but when Mrs D was questioned about this by Revolut, she said she wasn't on the phone to anyone or being guided to move her money. So, this alleviated Revolut's concerns.

Mrs D's representative has said she was vulnerable at the time of the scam. I'm sorry to hear of the difficulties and challenging times Mrs D has been experiencing. I've have considered this point when coming to the outcome I've reached, but I've not seen any information to show me Mrs D had told Revolut about her vulnerabilities at the point she was making the payments.

Mrs D has asked that Revolut refund the money she lost due to the scam. I understand that this will have been frustrating for her. But I've thought carefully about everything that has happened, and with all the circumstances of this complaint in mind I don't think Revolut needs to pay Mrs D any compensation. I realise this means Mrs D is out of pocket and I'm sorry she's lost this money. However, for the reasons I've explained, I don't think I can reasonably uphold this complaint.

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 D to accept or reject my decision before 18 January 2026.

Tom Wagstaff
Ombudsman