DRN-5545642

The complaint

Mr I complains that Revolut Ltd didn't do enough to prevent him losing money to a job scam.

What happened

The detailed background to this complaint is well known to both parties. So, I'll only provide an overview of some of the key events here. In 2024, Mr I was the victim of a 'job scam'. He believed he had a genuine opportunity for remote work, which involved providing reviews and promoting products.

He was told he had to complete certain tasks and on occasions he had to make payments to top up his balance before withdrawals could be made. Mr I sent a significant amount of money from several accounts he held. But those relevant to this complaint are the payments made on his Revolut account. In summary there was a debit card payment of around £3,660 and an exchange of funds into cryptocurrency using Revolut's platform (which was later sent to the scam), both of which took place in July 2024. Mr I says he realised he'd been scammed when he was asked to make a payment to reset his password for his account with his 'employer'.

Ultimately Mr I complained to Revolut who didn't offer any redress. The matter was referred to our service and one of our Investigators didn't recommend that the complaint should be upheld. In summary he didn't think Revolut were responsible for the loss. Mr I disagrees and has asked for an Ombudsman to review his complaint.

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've reached the same outcome as our Investigator and for largely the same reasons. I accept that Mr I has been the victim of a cruel scam, but that doesn't mean he is automatically entitled to redress from Revolut. So despite my natural sympathy for him as a victim of crime, I can only fairly direct Revolut to do more if I think they failed in such a way that they caused his loss (or a part of it). I don't think they did, and I'll explain why.

It isn't in dispute that Mr I instructed the transactions in question himself, albeit that he was tricked into doing so. The starting position is that he will usually be responsible for his own actions, but that isn't the end of the story. Revolut should also be alert to the possibility of fraud, scams and the misappropriation of funds and do what they can to protect their customers from the same.

In the circumstances here Revolut did intervene to varying degrees in payments Mr I made or attempted to make. In addition to the transactions I've referred to above, several payments were blocked by Revolut. Revolut have done largely as I'd expect here, which is they've identified payments which presented an increased risk of being connected with a scam. They've blocked payments and have asked questions to try to identify the associated risk and have then provided appropriate warnings.

Throughout the course of the questions asked around that time, Mr I told Revolut that he was investing in cryptocurrency and that he wasn't being guided or pressured into making a payment. Our Investigator asked Mr I why he'd answered questions from Revolut in the way he did rather than explaining that it was part of a 'job opportunity' where he had to make payments, particularly as our Investigator said payments towards a job opportunity was one of the options Revolut gave when asking the reason for a payment.

Mr I told our Investigator *"I was in an extremely distressed state and under direct pressure from the scammers, who manipulated me in real time via chat into answering Revolut's prompts in ways that would allow the payments to proceed. I was even explicitly told what to say… Despite your claim that "related to a job opportunity" was an option in Revolut's system, I firmly recall that it was not visible at the time of my selections. More importantly, even if it had been, I was not in a sound mental state to make a rational decision, especially as the scammers were actively guiding me."*

Some of the warnings Revolut gave highlighted the importance of answering their questions truthfully and that if Mr I was being told what to say, it could be a scam. Yet Mr I's own testimony is that the scammers were guiding him in real time through the answers via the chat facility on their website. With the above factors in mind, I don't think that any reasonable level of intervention that fairly could've been expected of Revolut would've been impactful in preventing the scam. It follows that I don't think Revolut are responsible for Mr I's loss on that basis.

Mr I says he was vulnerable as he was a recently graduated international student. I'm not sure that this is a basis upon which I'd consider Mr I to be vulnerable. But in any case, I can't see that Mr I had informed Revolut of this, prior to when he reported the scam, or that this is something they should have ascertained themselves in the circumstances here. And even if Revolut had identified Mr I as vulnerable at the material time, I'm not persuaded this would've meant he wouldn't have similarly misled them as to his reasons for the payments or that this would've resulted in discovery of the scam.

I've next thought about whether Revolut could've done more to help Mr I once informed of the scam. But here, as the payments all went to cryptocurrency, I don't think there was any reasonable prospect of a successful recovery being made. So I don't think anything Revolut did or didn't do in that regard, would've made a difference to the position Mr I now finds himself in.

Again, I'm of course sorry to hear that Mr I lost money as he did, but because I don't think this is something Revolut are responsible for, there isn't a reasonable basis upon which I can require them to do more to resolve this complaint.

My final decision

For the reasons outlined 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 Mr I to accept or reject my decision before 4 September 2025.

Richard Annandale
Ombudsman