

The complaint

Mr N complains that Revolut Ltd ('Revolut') won't refund the money he lost to an investment scam.

He's represented by a firm of solicitors. To keep things simple, I'll refer to Mr N throughout this decision.

What happened

The background is known to both parties. I won't repeat all the details.

In summary, Mr N says he was searching online for investment opportunities and came across what he thought was a genuine company (I'll call 'X'). He registered his interest and was contacted by its 'representative'. He carried out some due diligence and found nothing concerning at the time. He later discovered he'd connected with a scammer.

He says the scammer instructed him to open new accounts with Revolut and another firm ('C') and to install remote access software so they could 'help' him. And believing he was dealing with a professional and experienced individual, he went on to make payments as instructed. The money was sent from his Revolut account to his account with a crypto-platform ('I') before that cryptocurrency was sent and lost to the scam.

He realised he'd been scammed when he was asked to pay further 'fees', he could no longer access X's platform, and contact with the scammer suddenly stopped. By that time, almost £70,000 had been sent from Revolut across four payments in October 2023. Some of that money came from loans Mr N took out with various other lenders.

The scam was reported to Revolut in February 2024. A complaint was referred to our Service. Our Investigator considered it and didn't uphold it. He noted Mr N was coached by the scammer and both Revolut and C had been misled when they intervened. On balance, he didn't think Revolut could have likely prevented the scam.

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 decided not to uphold it for similar reasons as the Investigator.

In broad terms, the starting position at law is that a firm (like Revolut) is expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make, in accordance with the Payment Services Regulations (the 2017 regulations) and the terms and conditions of the customer's account. It's not in dispute that Mr N authorised the payments in question, so he's presumed liable for his losses in the first instance.

But that's not the end of the matter. Taking longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements into account, and what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time, Revolut should have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and made

additional checks before processing payments in some circumstances.

In this case, I agree there was enough about Mr N's payments for Revolut to have stepped in on concerns that he might be at a heightened risk of fraud – considering, for example, some of their values and the elevated risks associated with the type of payee. But I'm not persuaded timely and proportionate interventions would have likely made a difference to what happened here, such that I can reasonably hold Revolut liable for Mr N's losses.

As referred to by the Investigator, Revolut did intervene on payments. On 16 October 2023, a transfer was blocked. Mr N was brought into 'live' chat for further checks and was warned that Revolut suspected the payment he was attempting was part of a scam. When asked if anyone had told him to install remote access, Mr N replied "no". He was warned scammers use sophisticated techniques and convince customers to transfer funds into complex scams. But when asked if he'd been asked to create a Revolut account for investment purposes, Mr N again replied "no".

There was another block on 18 October 2023. Mr N was warned that Revolut suspected the payment he was attempting was part of a scam. Mr N replied *"I know what I am doing. Fully aware of the risks. I would not keep on sending money to something I don't think is secure"*. When asked why he was sending money through Revolut, he replied *"because it's easier ...my bank is asking me even more questions than you are"*. I note Mr N was then warned about fake online investments, celebrity endorsements and clone websites. He was told specifically that *"Criminals may get in touch claiming to be financial advisers and ask you to download remote access, so they can make investments on your behalf."*

I also note that when payments were stopped by C (the originating bank) it too was misled about their true purpose. In those interactions, Mr N told C he was moving funds for better interest and he provided convincing explanations as to why that was. At no point, was anything said about the payments being for 'investment' on instruction of a third-party. And I can see, from the scam chat, Mr N reverted to the scammer on payment blocks.

I'm not convinced, on the evidence, he was prepared to reveal anything significant about what he was really involved in. Even if I were to say Revolut should have gone further than it did at times, I'm not persuaded that would have likely led to the scam being exposed. In my view, Mr N was heavily under the scammer's 'spell'. He has himself described why he thought the opportunity was genuine. And I think it's significant he'd been communicating with the scammer for some months by the time these payments came about.

I appreciate Mr N's comments that Revolut shouldn't allow a payment to be processed to a 'safe account'. But, as explained by the Investigator, that's not what happened. Before one of the payments was processed, Mr N was asked further questions (as I'd have expected) around what he'd said was a payment reason. He confirmed he wasn't moving funds because he'd been told his money was at 'risk'. He was provided with a relevant warning. We know Mr N wasn't falling victim to a 'safe account' scam in any event. And, given what I've set out, it's not clear to me proportionate questioning would have unravelled the scam.

I'm sorry Mr N was scammed and about the impact the whole experience has had on him. I'm mindful he was a victim in all this and that it's affected him deeply. But, for the reasons I've given, I don't think it would be fair and reasonable to hold Revolut responsible for what happened. Nor do I find there were other significant failings on its part that would otherwise lead me to uphold this complaint. In terms of recovery, I'm satisfied there was little it could have done as the funds were sent to Mr N's account and had been moved on by the time the matter was reported. If any remained, Mr N would have been able to access them himself.

My final decision

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

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr N to accept or reject my decision before 6 October 2025.

Thomas Cardia
Ombudsman