

The complaint

Mr C complains that Revolut Ltd didn't do enough to prevent him losing money to a scam.

Although Mr C now brings the complaint himself, he was previously helped by a representative. But, for ease of reading, I'll mostly just refer to Mr C, where I also mean the representative.

What happened

The detailed background to this complaint is well known to both parties. So, I'll only provide an overview of some of the key events here. In 2023 Mr C was the victim of an investment scam. He was tricked into believing that he was making a payment towards a genuine opportunity. As a result of the scam he made a payment from his newly opened Revolut account for £5,600. Mr C says he then saw that amount in his 'trading' account.

When Mr C later realised he'd been scammed, he reported this to Revolut. Ultimately Revolut didn't offer any redress and the matter was referred to our service. One of our Investigators didn't recommend that the complaint should be upheld. In summary, she thought Revolut had acted fairly. Mr C disagreed and asked for an Ombudsman to review his complaint. In June 2025 I issued a provisional decision in which I said:

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 intending to reach a slightly different outcome to that of our Investigator. So, I'm issuing this provisional decision to give both sides a further opportunity to comment before my decision is finalised.

Revolut's first obligation is to follow the payment instructions their customers (like Mr C in this case) provide. But they should also be alert to the potential for fraud and scams and do what they can to mitigate the risk of financial harm through fraud. Our Investigator has already explained in some detail how Revolut intervened in Mr C's £5,600 payment. But as a summary, they identified it presented a risk, asked questions as to its nature and went as far as forcing Mr C into a chat with an agent. Throughout this process, Revolut:

- *Told Mr C his payment had been flagged by their system as a potential scam.*
- *Asked him to answer questions truthfully and explained that if he is being scammed, the fraudster may ask him to hide the real reason for his payment.*
- *Asked him to confirm he wasn't being guided as to how to answer questions or through making the payment.*
- *Asked the purpose of the payment to which Mr C said 'something else' with Mr C also indicating that the payment was for a personal reason.*
- *Asked him to confirm he hadn't downloaded screen sharing software and that he hadn't been told to ignore warnings.*
- *Warned him about giving remote access and to be wary of unexpected calls.*
- *Had Mr C agree that "Revolut has warned me that this payment is suspicious and I*

understand the risk of losing my money.”

Following on from this the payment was processed. In the circumstances of this complaint, I think this was reasonable. Mr C’s account was newly opened and this was the first significant payment being made from it. And whilst Mr C didn’t fully share the reasons for his payment and just pressed for it to be made, I don’t think there was enough for Revolut to have refused his instruction. They’d provided warnings as to the risks involved and once they had exhausted that process, I think it was reasonable for them to process the payment in this case.

I’m also aware that at that point, Mr C was deeply under the influence of the scammer (which no doubt caused him to not accurately answer Revolut’s questions). So even if Revolut had held the payment, I think it’s most likely Mr C would’ve made it from another account of his instead and wouldn’t have ended up in a meaningfully different position.

I also agree with our Investigator that I don’t think a recovery was likely, irrespective of Revolut’s actions in that regard. I say this because the recipient bank had concluded their customer wasn’t involved in the scam (and had sold cryptocurrency peer to peer). So there was never likely to be a recovery possible in that situation.

However, where my outcome differs from that of our Investigator is in relation to the service provided to Mr C by Revolut throughout the process of reporting the scam. From the chat history I can see that Mr C provided Revolut with a full copy of his report to Action Fraud on 5 December 2023. Revolut’s agent didn’t accept this and said they would need an actual police report to proceed further. Mr C (correctly) explained that Action Fraud are linked to the police and take reports of fraud and scams, yet he was sent to try to obtain an actual police report. When he returned after the police telling him that the Action Fraud report should be sufficient, this was again refused by Revolut and he was directed to obtain a report signed by his ‘local authorities’. Mr C again returned to the police, without success and at this point, Revolut directed him to make a Subject Access Request (SAR).

It is common for a report to Action Fraud to be sufficient for most businesses’ purposes in these circumstances. And I think it’s most likely that Revolut’s agent was mistaken and should’ve accepted the Action Fraud report. And whilst this wouldn’t have impacted whether any money could’ve been recovered (for the reasons already given). I think Mr C was put through avoidable distress and inconvenience (in going back to the police multiple times). And all this was at a time where he was coming to terms with having lost a significant amount of money to a scam, likely increasing the impact upon him. Whilst what has happened clearly now can’t be undone, I think a fair way to put things right for the poor service provided would be for Revolut to pay Mr C £200 compensation for the avoidable trouble and upset caused. I think this is an appropriate amount in the context of the error that Revolut are responsible for. It isn’t intended to compensate him for all the distress in the wider circumstances, as the fault for the bulk of that sits with the cruel scammer, not Revolut.

I appreciate this still leaves Mr C at a loss for the payment he made. And I don’t think later providing poor service could fairly be a basis upon which a full refund should be given. But I’m currently minded that the compensation award I’m proposing is a fair way to resolve this complaint.”

Mr C responded to say he accepted my provisional decision. Revolut responded and said they had nothing to add and would await the final 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.

As neither party had any further comments or evidence for my consideration, I see no reason to deviate from the outcome explained in my provisional decision.

My final decision

For the reasons set out above, my final decision is that I uphold this complaint in part.

Revolut Ltd must pay Mr C £200 compensation for the impact of the poor service provided.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr C to accept or reject my decision before 21 July 2025.

Richard Annandale
Ombudsman