

## **The complaint**

Mr W is complaining that Revolut Ltd won't refund a payment he says he didn't authorise, when he fell victim to a scam.

## **What happened**

Mr W says that he received a scam phone call on 8 December 2024. The caller said they were calling from his bank and Mr W says they had a lot of his account details which made them seem genuine. The caller said his bank account had been compromised and an attempt had been made to move money out of it. Payments were made from Mr W's bank account as a result of this call which he disputed with his bank.

Shortly after the first call Mr W received another scam call from someone who said they were from Revolut. The caller said his Revolut account had also been compromised. A debit card payment of £1,000 was then made to a cryptocurrency provider from Mr W's Revolut account. Mr W says he recalls sharing a security number or PIN, but he didn't intend to authorise a payment and he can't remember approving a payment in his Revolut app. Mr W has also told us he used to have an account with this particular cryptocurrency provider, but it had been blocked, and he hadn't used it for over a year.

Mr W reported what had happened to Revolut later on the same day. He says he was initially reassured the payment would be refunded to him, but Revolut went on to tell him it was unable to dispute the payment. Mr W made a complaint, and Revolut issued its final response on 17 December 2024. It said, in summary, that it had concluded he'd authorised the payment and there were no grounds for it to raise a chargeback under the relevant card scheme's chargeback rules.

Mr W referred his complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service. Our Investigator looked into what had happened, but she didn't think Mr W's complaint should be upheld. Mr W didn't agree, so his complaint has been passed to me for review and a decision.

## **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'm not upholding Mr W's complaint. I'll explain why.

I should explain that here, the disputed payment was made to a cryptocurrency provider. From my understanding of how this cryptocurrency provider operates, the payment could only have been made to an account held in Mr W's own name with it, and it's not clear to me exactly how the funds were lost to the scam from there. But I'm only mentioning this for completeness as it doesn't make a difference to the outcome of Mr W's complaint about Revolut.

*Did Mr W authorise the payment?*

The relevant law here is the Payment Services Regulations 2017 – these set out what is needed for a payment to be authorised and who has liability for disputed payments in different situations. With some exceptions, the starting point is that the consumer is responsible for authorised payments, and the business is responsible for unauthorised payments.

Mr W disputes authorising the payment, so I'll address this point first.

The PSRs specify that authorisation depends on whether the payment transaction was authenticated correctly – and whether Mr W, or someone acting on his behalf, consented to it.

The PSRs go on to specify how consent is given. It must be in the form, and in accordance with the procedure, agreed between Mr W and Revolut. I've reviewed the terms of Mr W's account with Revolut, but they don't appear to specify exactly how he gives consent to card payments. But broadly speaking, this is usually through entering the long card number, the card expiry date and CVV into the merchant's website.

Mr W has said he wasn't aware the payment was being made, so it wasn't him that gave the payment instruction. But Revolut says the payment was authorised as Mr W approved the payment in its app.

Revolut has sent some screenshots to show that the process flow here has steps which involve being sent a push notification showing a payment is waiting to be reviewed. This then opens a screen in the app asking for the payment to be reviewed. The payment amount and who it's being made to is shown on the screen with an option to confirm or reject the payment. I think it would have been clear from these screens that a payment was being approved. I've also seen evidence that the payment was approved on Mr W's trusted device that was already linked to his Revolut account and was registered in November 2024, and which apparently remained in his possession. The app can only be accessed using Mr W's biometrics on his device, or by entering his password or passcode.

Mr W says he does recall sharing a code with the caller but it's not clear to me what this was in relation to because I can't see that a code was used to approve the disputed payment or that anyone else was able to log into his Revolut account. Although I appreciate Mr W can't recall doing this, I think he did approve the payment using the process Revolut's outlined.

Although Mr W says he didn't enter his card details to make the payment, I'm satisfied that the payment was correctly authenticated using his card information and stronger authentication through the app. So, I think it was reasonable for Revolut to consider the payment instruction to be genuine and to process the payment. As such, it's reasonable for Revolut to treat the payment as having been authorised and it's not obliged to provide a refund.

#### *Should Revolut have recognised the scam and intervened?*

I've concluded that the payment was authorised, so I've now gone on to consider if Revolut should have done anything else to prevent it. And I don't think it should have. I'll explain why.

When a payment is authorised, Revolut has a duty to act on the payment instruction. But in some circumstances, it should take a closer look at the circumstances of the payment – for example, if it ought to be alert to a fraud risk, because the transaction is unusual, or looks out of character or suspicious. And if so, it should intervene, for example, by contacting the customer directly, before releasing the payment. I'd expect any intervention to be proportionate to the circumstances of the payment.

But I've also kept in mind that Revolut processes high volumes of transactions each day. There is a balance for it to find between allowing customers to be able to use their account and questioning transactions to confirm they're legitimate.

When the disputed payment was made, I don't think there was anything about it that I'd expect to have caused Revolut any concern that Mr W was at risk of significant financial harm though a scam. Although I appreciate it was a lot of money for Mr W to lose, the value of the payment wasn't significant in the context of the payments Revolut processes every day, and it was certainly below the value where I'd expect Revolut to have taken a closer look at it. So, I wouldn't have expected Revolut to have identified a scam risk and intervened before it was processed.

### *Could Revolut have done more to recover the payment?*

The payment was made by debit card, and as such once it had been authorised it wasn't possible for Revolut to recall or cancel it, even in a pending state. It's possible to dispute a debit card payment through a process called chargeback, which can sometimes be attempted if something has gone wrong with a debit card purchase, but this is subject to the relevant card scheme's rules.

Revolut doesn't appear to have raised a chargeback when Mr W disputed the payment, but I would only have expected it to do so if there were reasonable grounds to raise it under the card scheme's rules. And I'm satisfied that there would have been little prospect of a chargeback being successful here. I say this because I've concluded the payment was authorised by Mr W, and because the funds would have been credited to the account held with the cryptocurrency provider, so there wouldn't have been grounds for chargeback against the cryptocurrency provider on the basis that goods or services hadn't been provided.

I appreciate that Mr W has told us that his bank has refunded the disputed payments from the same scam after he raised chargebacks with it and feels that Revolut has treated him unfairly by not doing the same, but I can only consider the circumstances of his complaint about Revolut. And as I've explained, I've not found that there were grounds under the rules for Revolut to have raised a chargeback against the cryptocurrency provider for this disputed payment or if it had done, that it was likely to have been successful. So, I can't conclude that Revolut should reasonably have done anything else to recover the payment.

I'm really sorry to disappoint Mr W. It appears he's fallen victim to a cruel scam, and I can understand why he'd think he should receive a refund. But I've not found that Revolut ought reasonably to have done anything else to prevent his loss. So, it wouldn't be fair or reasonable to ask it to refund the disputed payment to him.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I'm not upholding Mr W's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr W to accept or reject my decision before 30 January 2026.

Helen Sutcliffe  
**Ombudsman**