

## The complaint

Mr O complains Monzo Bank Ltd has recorded his personal details with Cifas – a fraud prevention database – and won't remove them.

## What happened

On 17 January 2025, Mr O received two payments into his Monzo account for £500 and £400. Monzo received notification that both payments were fraudulent.

Monzo asked Mr O about the £500 payment. Mr O said the money had been sent to his account for a friend by someone that the friend knew – Mr O said he wasn't entitled to the money.

Monzo decided to close Mr O's account and he discovered it had registered his details with Cifas. So he complained to Monzo. Monzo responded to say it hadn't made a mistake in registering the fraud marker.

Mr O referred his complaint to our service. An Investigator considered the circumstances. She said, in summary, she thought Monzo had registered the fraud marker fairly.

Mr O didn't agree with the Investigator's findings. He said, although he accepts he had allowed someone to pay money into his account, the specific transaction Monzo had asked him about was returned to sender – so he didn't benefit from it.

As Mr O didn't agree, the complaint's 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.

The marker Monzo has registered in Mr O's case is a "misuse of facility". In order to record a marker for misuse of facility, Monzo must be able to show a number of requirements have been met, including:

- There must be reasonable grounds to believe that an identified fraud or financial crime has been committed or attempted.
- The evidence must be clear, relevant and rigorous.

Here, Mr O's account received two payments which were later reported as fraudulent. Monzo contacted Mr O and it's provided the messages it exchanged with him about one of the payments for £500.

Mr O has told us that the person who sent the funds to him was a friend, B. He said he'd previously given B his bank details in 2023 because B had asked to send him money at that time. But no money was ever received. Then in January 2025, the payments into Mr O's account just appeared with no prior warning from B. Mr O has also told us the reason he

agreed to receive the money on B's behalf, was because B was planning to come to the UK to study, as Mr O had done.

Mr O has provided a copy of the messages he exchanged with B – these messages go back to 2022. The messages show that Mr O had agreed to receive money on B's behalf previously on several occasions between 2022 and 2025. On 10 January 2025, Mr O and B exchanged messages in which Mr O said:

*"Please confirm where the payment is coming from.*

*This is my personal account so you should try to think as if it's your account"*

B responded to these comments saying "clean funds only". Then Mr O agreed to receive money from B. Our Investigator asked Mr O what is meant by use of the term "clean funds". He told her this is a term used for money sent by his friend only. But Mr O didn't then receive funds from B, the payments into Mr O's account came from accounts in different names and I can see from the statements this had happened before. I find it's clear from Mr O's contact with B that there was an ongoing arrangement for Mr O to receive money on B's behalf. And that Mr O had concerns about where the money was coming from before he received the payment on 17 January 2025. Throughout the chat Mr O has provided there's no reference at all to any of the payments being sent in relation to B's plan to come to the UK to study – which Mr O has told us was the purpose of the payments. Mr O's explanations also don't match with the information Monzo received about the fraudulent payments. So, I find the evidence Mr O has provided doesn't support the explanations he's given.

Mr O accepts that he wasn't entitled to the £500 payment he received but says he didn't benefit from it. While that may be the case, Mr O has allowed his account to be used to receive money that was later reported as having been sent fraudulently. Whether or not Mr O kept the money doesn't change Monzo's entitlement to register the fraud marker.

For completeness, I would ordinarily have expected Monzo to also make enquiries with Mr O about the second payment reported as fraudulent. But, given the evidence in relation to the first payment, I don't think this makes a difference to the overall outcome of Mr O's complaint.

Overall, Mr O hasn't been able to provide sufficient evidence to support his explanations. In these circumstances, I'm satisfied this means Monzo was entitled to register the marker with Cifas. To be clear, I'm not making any finding on Mr O's involvement in the alleged fraudulent payment itself, just that Monzo has shown it's registered the fraud marker correctly.

Mr O has told us the Cifas marker is causing him distress and financial hardship. I'm sorry to hear that's the case but as I've found the marker was added correctly, I don't find Monzo need to remove it.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons I've explained, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr O to accept or reject my decision before 28 October 2025.

Eleanor Rippengale  
**Ombudsman**

