

## **The complaint**

Mrs G complains Revolut Ltd didn't do enough to protect her when she fell victim to a job scam.

## **What happened**

Mrs G has an account with Revolut and an account with another business who I'll refer to as "S" throughout the rest of this decision.

Mrs G says she was looking online for jobs she could do from home when she saw an advert about an opportunity to earn an hourly salary and commission. She says she expressed interest and was contacted by someone on social media who explained what the job involved and that she'd be working for two household names. She was, in fact, talking to a scammer.

Mrs G says the job involved completing tasks on two separate platforms and that she needed to send cryptocurrency to the platforms in question to take on tasks. She says the scammer encouraged her to open an account with Revolut – which she did on 21 August 2023 – and download cryptocurrency apps.

Having opened an account with Revolut, Mrs G transferred just over £2,200 to her account with Revolut from her account with S. She then used this £2,200 to buy cryptocurrency so she could take on tasks. This was all done over a period of two days. Mrs G says she realised she'd been scammed when she ran out of money – even after having borrowed from friends and family – meaning she wasn't able to complete her tasks and wasn't able to claim the profits she'd been told she'd made. The scammer's response to her predicament was to suggest she take out a loan. Mrs G contacted Revolut and S.

Revolut looked into Mrs G's claim and says it attempted to chargeback the payments to the cryptocurrency providers she'd made. Revolut says the chargebacks – some of which it raised in November 2023 rather than straightaway – were unsuccessful. Mrs G complained. In response to her complaint, Revolut said that the payments Mrs G had made weren't large enough or unusual enough to be of concern and that it had handled her chargebacks correctly. In the circumstances, it said it wasn't able to refund Mrs G. Mrs G was unhappy with Revolut's response – and S's response – and so complained to our service.

One of our investigators looked into Mrs G's complaints and said that Revolut would have had no reason to be concerned about the payments that Mrs G was making except for potentially the last one. That's because by the time Mrs G made her last payment our investigator thought that a pattern was emerging that ought to have been of concern to Revolut. Our investigator thought that Revolut should have given Mrs G a warning about the common features of a cryptocurrency scam – as that would be the most appropriate thing to do in the circumstances. Had Revolut done so, however, our investigator didn't think it would have stopped Mrs G from making her final payment. So, they didn't think Revolut needed to do more as they didn't think Revolut had missed an opportunity to prevent further losses.

Mrs G disagreed with our investigator saying that she'd only continued making payments to the scammer because she'd been pressurised into doing so, and that she wouldn't have

done so had Revolut warned her that she might be falling victim to a scam. She asked for her complaints to be referred to an ombudsman for a decision. Her complaints were, as a result, 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.

Earlier on this month I issued a provisional decision in which I said:

*"In this case I'm satisfied that Mrs G made three card payments to cryptocurrency on 21 August 2024 – in the space of four hours – and six card payments to cryptocurrency on 22 August 2024 – in the space of seven hours. Five of the nine payments Mrs G made were for £150 or less. Two were for just over £300, one for just over £400 and one for just over £600. Revolut had no historical data to go on – as Mrs G had only just opened the account – but the payments were in line with the purposes she'd given for opening the account and, more importantly, given that they were all relatively small payments and spaced out, I don't think Revolut ought to have had any reason to be concerned. In other words, I don't agree that this was a case where Revolut needed to intervene. Nor do I agree that the chargebacks were handled incorrectly. For these reasons, I agree with our investigator that it wouldn't be fair to hold Revolut liable for the losses Mrs G has evidently made. I appreciate that she has been the victim of a scam, and I have every sympathy for her."*

Both parties were invited to respond to my provisional decision. Mrs G's representatives did and said that they had nothing to add. Revolut didn't. Having reconsidered everything again, I remain of the view that Revolut had no reason to be concerned about the payments Mrs G was making and didn't handle the chargebacks incorrectly. I also, therefore, remain of the view that it wouldn't be fair to hold Revolut liable for the losses Mrs G has evidently made.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I'm not upholding this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs G to accept or reject my decision before 25 April 2025.

Nicolas Atkinson  
**Ombudsman**