

The complaint

Miss A complains that Revolut Ltd ('Revolut') won't reimburse the funds she lost when she fell victim to a scam.

What happened

Miss A says that she saw an advert on social media and provided her contact details. Soon after, she received a message offering her a remote job role as a 'data optimiser'. The role involved providing ratings. Miss A didn't know at the time, but the job was fake, and she was dealing with scammers.

Miss A was required to pay in cryptocurrency to remove a negative balance on the fake platform. On 30 January 2025 she made a faster payment of £240 to her own cryptocurrency account and from there to a wallet controlled by scammers.

Miss A realised she was the victim of a scam when she kept being asked to deposit further funds. She reported the scam to Revolut on 30 Jan 2025. Revolut said that as Miss A had paid an account in her own name the PSR reimbursement rules didn't apply, and it wasn't responsible for her loss.

Miss A was unhappy with Revolut's response and brought a complaint to this service.

The investigator who considered this complaint didn't recommend that it be upheld. She didn't think the scam payment Miss A made was so unusual and out of character that Revolut ought reasonably to have had any concerns or taken additional steps.

Miss A was unhappy with the investigator's findings and asked for a final decision. In summary, she said:

- She was the victim of a sophisticated employment scam involving impersonation of a genuine company.
- The scammer initially misled her, saying she wouldn't be required to pay, but then pressured her to make payments.
- She was under financial pressure at the time and believes she was vulnerable.
- She believes the £240 payment should have been flagged, especially as it was to a provider of cryptocurrency.
- She reported the scam to all relevant parties promptly and provided all relevant information.

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 deciding what's fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of a complaint, I'm required to take into account relevant: law and regulations; regulators' rules, guidance and standards; codes of practice; and, where appropriate, what I consider to be good industry practice at the time.

I recognise that Miss A has been the victim of a cruel scam and that she has taken the appropriate steps to notify relevant parties and provide information. But these points alone don't mean that Revolut is responsible for her loss.

In broad terms, the starting position at law is that a bank 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.

The Financial Services and Markets Act 2023 required the Payment Systems Regulator (PSR) to introduce a reimbursement requirement for payments made over the Faster Payments Scheme as a result of fraud or dishonesty. Consequently in 2024, the PSR required the Faster Payments scheme operator (PayUK) to change the Faster Payment Rules to require the firms that operate over Faster Payments to reimburse their customers sums paid as a result of APP (authorised push payment) scams in certain circumstances. These Rules, which I'll call the Reimbursement Rules, came into force on 7 October 2024. But the Reimbursement Rules don't cover payments to an account in a customer's own name, so I can't apply them here.

I've gone on to consider Revolut's wider obligations. Revolut should be on the lookout for, and protect its customers from, potentially falling victim to fraud or scams. This includes monitoring accounts and identifying suspicious activity that appears out of character. Where potential fraud is identified, I would expect Revolut to intervene and attempt to prevent losses for the customer.

In this case Miss A made a payment of £240 to a provider of cryptocurrency. Having considered Miss A's account activity in the 12-month period before the scam I don't think this payment was out of character or that Revolut ought reasonably to have done more before processing it. I can see that Miss A set the cryptocurrency provider up as a payee on 11 January 2025 and had already made some payments to it. A payment of £240 wasn't at a level where I'd expect Revolut to have concerns. There's a balance to be struck between Revolut identifying concerning payments and responding appropriately to any concerns, and minimising disruption to legitimate payment journeys.

Miss A says she was under financial pressure at the time which made her vulnerable. I have already explained that the Reimbursement Rules aren't relevant to this complaint, so I can't consider its provisions in respect of vulnerability. And I can't see that Miss A told Revolut that she needed any additional support before the payment was made. So I don't think Revolut ought reasonably to have done anything more to protect Miss A.

As the payment was to an account in Miss A's name there was nothing Revolut could have done to recover it.

Overall, whilst I'm sorry Miss A has lost money in a scam, I can't fairly require Revolut to reimburse her.

My final decision

For the reasons stated, I do not 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 25 December 2025.

Jay Hadfield
Ombudsman