

## **The complaint and background**

Mrs F is unhappy Monzo Bank Ltd ('Monzo') won't reimburse £1,000 that she lost when she fell victim to a cryptocurrency investment scam.

Our investigator didn't uphold the complaint. She didn't think any of the payments looked suspicious such that Monzo ought to have made additional checks before processing any of them.

Our investigator also found that prior to making the payments from her account with Monzo, Mrs F had already been notified by another bank this was a scam. So, she asked Mrs F why she continued to make payments when she'd already been warned by another bank. Mrs F explained she'd been manipulated by the scammer and because she wanted to get her money back from them, she was promised that by investing more she'd be able to do that.

Mrs F believed that Monzo could have prevented the scam. And as agreement couldn't be reached, the case has been referred 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.

Having taken into account longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements, and what I consider to be good industry practice, Monzo ought to have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and made additional checks before processing payments in some circumstances.

I have reviewed Mrs F's account and the payments she made to the scam. I'm in agreement with our investigator. Having considered when they were made, their value and who they were made to, I'm not persuaded Monzo ought to have found any of the payments suspicious, such that it ought to have made enquiries of Mrs F before processing them. I accept the payments were to a crypto provider, but that doesn't mean payments should automatically be treated as suspicious, particularly when there are no other concerning factors about the payments.

That said, as our investigator had brought to Mrs F's attention, she had already been warned by another bank that she was falling victim to a scam. Mrs F was prevented from making a payment, but instead of stopping, Mrs F opened an account with Monzo to facilitate payments to the scam instead. She said she did so because she'd been manipulated by the scammer.

That said, Monzo did have multiple telephone interactions with Mrs F too about the disputed transactions. She was questioned by Monzo about what she was doing and was untruthful in her responses. Mrs F insisted there was no one else involved and no one asking her to do anything. She also said her account had been opened for the purposes of receiving funds as

it was her birthday – when it's clear that wasn't the case, as the only activity was Mrs F facilitating payments to the scam.

Monzo raised concerns with Mrs F about what she was doing and its clear her responses sought to frustrate its attempts to protect her from falling victim to a scam. She even said '*I really respect my banks concerns, but at the end of the day if I do lose my money, it's my own doing. No one else is involved*'.

Whilst Mrs F says she believes Monzo could have prevented the scam, given the interactions that did take place I'm not persuaded by this. As Mrs F has explained, she was manipulated by the scammers and went so far as to mislead Monzo about what was actually going on. She'd also been warned by another bank previously. So even if I did consider Monzo could have gone further – and I don't, I'm not satisfied Mrs F's losses would've been prevented.

I'm not persuaded there were any prospects of Monzo successfully recovering the funds, given the money was used to purchase crypto-currency from a legitimate provider.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons given 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 Mrs F to accept or reject my decision before 7 November 2025.

Mark O'Connor  
**Ombudsman**