

The complaint

Mr T complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund the full amount of money he 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.

Mr T complains that he sent several payments from his account with Revolut to what he believed was a legitimate investment. When Mr T realised he had been scammed, he logged a complaint with Revolut.

Revolut looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. So, Mr T brought his complaint to our service.

Our investigator looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. Our investigator thought the intervention by Revolut was proportionate in the circumstances of the payments.

As no formal agreement could be reached, 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 Institute, it also has long-standing obligations to help protect customers from financial harm from fraud and scams.

Given the value of payment two, I agree with the investigator that Revolut ought to have been concerned that Mr T could have been at risk of financial harm.

Here though Revolut did intervene on payment two and asked Mr T for the purpose of the payment. Rather than selecting investment (which is what Mr T has told us he thought he

was doing) he selected that he was making a transfer to his other account.

Mr T then got a tailored warning in line with the payment purpose he selected. Although this wasn't the most accurate purpose he could have selected, he still got warnings relevant to the scam he was falling victim to. Mr T was told not to download any screen sharing software, not to be guided by anyone, and to do research on where he was sending his money. The warning also told Mr T that if someone was telling him to ignore the warnings, they are a scammer.

Mr T had downloaded screen sharing software, was being guided by telephone and messaging services which included being told to ignore the banks warnings - and there was also information online to say that the company he was sending money to was a scam. So, although Revolut gave Mr T relevant warnings, this didn't stop him making the payments.

Mr T also got a warning from his other bank advising not to trust businesses advertising on social media sites, which is where Mr T found the scam company. Given Mr T's representative has said Mr T was being coached by the scammer on how to answers any questions and to ignore warnings, it hindered Revolut's ability to uncover the scam.

Revolut didn't intervene on the third and last payment Mr T made, but given its value, a proportionate warning here would have been similar to the first, and I've not seen anything to suggest Mr T would have answered the questions any differently or acted on the warnings had they been displayed again.

Mr T's representative has said Mr T was vulnerable at the time of the payments as he had separated from his partner. I've not seen anything to show me Revolut was aware of any vulnerabilities at the time. The payments also didn't go direct to the scam company, so Revolut would not have found any negative information on any of its automatic checking systems about where the money was sent to first.

Whilst Mr T has undoubtedly been the victim of a cruel scam, I don't find there were any failings on Revolut's part that would lead me to 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 Mr T to accept or reject my decision before 8 December 2025.

Tom Wagstaff
Ombudsman