DRN-5463491

The complaint

Miss A complains that Monzo Bank Ltd ('Monzo') have failed to refund around £9,000 she says she lost to a job scam.

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties. So, if there's a submission I've not addressed; it isn't because I've ignored the point. It's simply because my findings focus on what I consider to be the central issues in this complaint – that being whether Monzo was responsible for Miss A's loss.

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.

Having done so, I agree with the conclusions reached by our Investigator for the following reasons:

- It isn't in dispute that Miss A authorised the transactions in question. She is therefore presumed liable for the loss in the first instance. However, Monzo is aware, taking longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements into account, and what I consider to be good industry practice at the time, that it should have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and made additional checks before processing payments in some circumstances.
- I appreciate Miss A has lost around £9,000 which is a significant amount of money. But this wasn't paid in a single large transaction. The payments were spread out over 5 sequential days, 14 individual payments and 8 different payees/ merchants with the single largest payment of £2,300. As such I don't consider the payments would've appeared particularly suspicious to Monzo. I'll explain why.
- This was very much in keeping with Miss A's account activity at the time where she was making multiple payments a day regularly – this also included non-disputed transactions at the time of the payments lost to the scam. And having reviewed Miss A's bank statements in the 12 months prior to the scam, I can see that she made multiple payments of £1,000 as well as payments for £5,410, £5,000, £3,800, £3,000, £2,400, among others. Although these payments aren't necessarily to crypto, previous spending from a customer's account (irrespective of the merchant or payee) is a relevant consideration as to whether disputed payments are unusual enough to flag as suspicious.
- And the values of the debit card payments that were made to identifiably crypto related merchants were of lower values. That said, payments to crypto won't always be as part of a scam, they can also be part of legitimate investment.
- Whilst Miss A's representatives consider the payments should have looked suspicious, I'm not persuaded, on balance, there was anything unusual or suspicious that ought reasonably to have triggered Monzo's fraud monitoring systems, or that would have indicated she might be in the process of being scammed.
- I've considered whether there are any ways Monzo could have recovered Miss A's money, but I don't consider it could have. Miss A bought genuine cryptocurrency with

the funds which she sent on as part of this scam. So she did receive what she paid for, even if she then lost it due to the scam.

My final decision

For the reasons given above, my final decision is that I don’t uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I’m required to ask Miss A to accept or reject my decision before 3 October 2025.

Mark O'Connor
Ombudsman