The complaint and background

Mr M complains that Revolut Ltd ("Revolut") didn't do enough to protect him when he fell victim to an employment scam between February and May 2024.

Our investigator didn't uphold the complaint. While he thought that Revolut should have intervened a day before it did, he didn't think this would have prevented Mr M's loss. This was because when Revolut did intervene, Mr M provided inaccurate responses to its questions.

Mr M disagreed. He said that Revolut allowed him to invest too high a proportion of his savings and so failed to protect him. And he said that multiple transactions to the same recipient should have looked unusual. So the complaint has 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.

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

Revolut did find some of Mr M's payments suspicious and I can see from the evidence provided that it asked him about the payments and provided warnings based on his responses. I agree with the investigator that Revolut could have enquired sooner about the payments. But I'm not persuaded that would have prevented his loss.

I say this because Mr M wasn't forthcoming with accurate information when Revolut asked him questions. He said he was making payments for investment purposes, though this wasn't accurate as he believed he was making payments as part of an employment opportunity. And he said he hadn't been contacted or encouraged to invest by someone he didn't know or had only met online recently but, again, we now know this to be untrue. As well as this, when asked if he understood what he was investing in he assured Revolut that he'd been investing with cryptocurrency since 2019. While that may have been the case, this money wasn't being used to fund an investment so was misleading. And withholding information about paying money for employment purposes prevented Revolut from giving him warnings specific to this scenario.

I should also add that Mr M was making payments to the same scam from another financial provider and, in much the same way, was providing assurances around the purpose of the payments so as to avoid alerting the provider to what was really happening. So, had Revolut intervened sooner or further, I'm not persuaded that this would have prevented Mr M's losses as I think it's likely he would have continued to respond to interventions in a similar way.

I'm not sure why Mr M provided misleading information or why he wasn't forthcoming about what the funds were being used for, particularly as he believed it to be a legitimate employment opportunity at the time. But it's worth noting that Mr M was becoming increasingly frustrated with Revolut's attempts to intervene and ask questions, potentially making it more challenging to have an open discussion about the purpose of the payments.

Overall, I'm persuaded that even if Revolut had intervened sooner, this wouldn't have prevented Mr M's losses as he wasn't forthcoming with accurate information when asked about the payments. Mr M has raised that Revolut should have intervened based on the percentage of his savings he was investing and the frequency of payments being made. But I'm satisfied that Revolut did intervene, and I wouldn't have expected it take any further action based on the answers and assurances from Mr M.

While Mr M has been the victim of a cruel scam, I can only uphold his complaint if I'm satisfied Revolut's failings made a material difference to what happened. For the reasons given, I'm not persuaded they did.

My final decision

For the reasons given, 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 M to accept or reject my decision before 26 August 2025.

Melanie van der Waals
Ombudsman