DRN-5525740

## The complaint

Mr A complains that Revolut Ltd blocked and closed his account without providing a proper explanation. He says this caused him unnecessary trouble and upset for which he should be compensated.

## What happened

Mr A had an account with Revolut, which he opened in 2019.

In December 2024, Revolut decided to review how Mr A was using his account in order to comply with its legal and regulatory obligations after it noticed Mr A was disputing a lot of activity on his account.

Revolut blocked Mr A's account whilst it completed its review. Mr A discovered that he was unable to use his account and contacted Revolut via its in-app chat to try and find out what was happening. Mr A told Revolut that he needed access to his account and Revolut's actions were impacting his ability to pay his bills and feed his children. In response, Revolut told Mr A that it had placed his account under review. But wouldn't give Mr A much more information other than t it would complete its review within 1 to 23 days.

Revolut completed its review and on 31 December 2024, decided to close Mr A's account. Revolut gave Mr A 60 days' notice that he'd need to make alternative banking arrangement and that he'd need to transfer his remaining money out of his account during the notice period.

Mr A complained to Revolut. He pointed out that he'd not done anything wrong and Revolut hadn't provided any evidence that he'd misused his account. He said the block and closure of his account had caused him a great deal of stress. To put things right he said Revolut should refund his account fee and give him a proper explanation for why it no longer wanted him as a customer.

In response, Revolut said it hadn't done anything wrong and had blocked and closed Mr A's account to comply with its regulatory obligations and had done so in line with the terms and conditions of Mr A's account. Revolut apologised for any trouble and upset this had caused Mr A. So, it didn't uphold Mr A's complaint.

Mr A remained unhappy and asked us to investigate his complaint. He said the block and closure of his account caused him a lot of problems. And impacted his well-being.

One of our investigators reviewed Mr A's complaint. They said whilst they appreciated Revolut actions had caused Mr A trouble and upset, they thought Revolut hadn't done anything wrong. So, they didn't uphold Mr A's complaint.

Mr A disagreed. He said Revolut hadn't treated him fairly and he asked for an Ombudsman to review his complaint. So, the matter has come 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 would add too that our rules allow us to receive evidence in confidence. We may treat evidence from financial businesses as confidential for a number of reasons – for example, if it contains information about other customers, security information or commercially sensitive information. Some of the information Revolut has provided is information that we considered should be kept confidential. This means I haven't been able to share a lot of detail with Mr A, but I'd like to reassure him that I have considered everything.

I appreciate that Mr A is upset that Revolut blocked and closed his account. But for me to uphold this complaint, I must be satisfied that Revolut has done something wrong. And in this case, I don't think it has. I'll explain why.

I want to make it clear that I understand why what happened concerned Mr A. I've no doubt it would've come as quite a shock to him, and he would've been very worried to find out that his account had been blocked. But, Revolut has extensive legal and regulatory responsibilities they must meet when providing account services to customers. They can broadly be summarised as a responsibility to protect persons from financial harm, and to prevent and detect financial crime. Sometimes that means they need to review accounts and go as far as closing them to comply with their responsibilities.

I've considered the basis for Revolut's review and having done so I find this was legitimate and in line with its legal and regulatory obligations. So, I'm satisfied Revolut acted fairly by blocking Mr A's account. I appreciate that Mr A wants to know more about why Revolut did what it did. And he disputes that he has done anything that would warrant Revolt's actions. But Revolut isn't obliged to tell Mr A why it blocked and reviewed his account, and I don't believe it would be appropriate for me to require it to do so as much as he'd like to know.

The terms and conditions of Mr A's account also make provision for Revolut to review and suspend an account. And having looked at all the evidence, including the information Revolut has shared with us in confidence, I'm satisfied that Revolut have acted in line with these when it suspended Mr A's account. So, although I understand not having access to his account caused Mr A trouble and upset it wouldn't be appropriate for me to award Mr A compensation since I don't believe Revolut acted inappropriately in taking the actions that it did when it blocked Mr A's account.

That being said, I agree that the timing of Revolut's review of Mr A's account was unfortunate. It was over the Christmas period. But whilst I have sympathy for Mr A it's not in my remit to tell Revolut what type of account review they should be conducting or when they should conduct account reviews. I can however, while considering the circumstances of individual complaints, decide whether I think customers have been treated fairly, which is what I have done.

The result of the review was that Revolut decided they didn't want to provide banking services to Mr A anymore. Revolut wrote to Mr A on 31 December 2024 to let him know that it had decided to close his account. I note too that Mr A did contact Revolut on 27 December 2024 asking to close his account.

It's generally for banks and financial businesses to decide whether or not they want to provide, or to continue to provide, account facilities to any particular customer. Unless there's a very good reason to do so, this service won't usually say that a bank or financial

business must keep customer or require it to compensate a customer who has had their account closed.

As long as banks and financial businesses reach their decisions fairly, it doesn't breach law or regulations and is in keeping with the terms and conditions of the account, then this service won't usually intervene. They shouldn't decline to continue to provide account services without proper reason, for instance of unfair bias or unlawful discrimination. And they must treat new and existing customers fairly.

Revolut have relied on the terms and conditions when closing Mr A's account. I've reviewed the terms, and they explain that in certain circumstances, Revolut can also close an account without notice, which is what happened here.

For Revolut to act fairly here they needed to meet the criteria to apply their terms for immediate closure. Revolut has provided some further details of its decision-making process, which led to the closure of Mr A's account. I'm sorry but I can't share this information with Mr A due to its commercial sensitivity. But I've seen nothing to suggest Revolut's decision around closing Mr A's account was unfair. On balance when considering Revolut's wider regulatory responsibilities and all the information available to me, I find Revolut had a legitimate basis for closing Mr A's account immediately. So, I can't say its treated Mr A unfairly and I won't be asking Revolut to refund Mr A's account fees

In summary, I recognise how strongly Mr A feels about his complaint, so I realise he will be disappointed by my decision. But overall, based on the evidence I've seen I won't be telling Revolut to do anything more to resolve Mr A's complaint.

## My final decision

For the reasons I've explained, my final decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr A to accept or reject my decision before 18 December 2025.

Sharon Kerrison
**Ombudsman**