

The complaint

Mr J complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund money he lost when he fell victim to a scam.

A representative who I will call "W" complains on behalf of Mr J, but for ease, I will refer to Mr J throughout.

What happened

The background of this complaint is well known to both parties so I'll only refer to the key events here.

In May 2024 Mr J fell victim to a scam when he sent money to what he believed to be an investment opportunity. Between June and October 2024 he made multiple payments to the scammer from different accounts, and while he received some returns making the opportunity appear legitimate, Mr J lost over £6,000.

Mr J has also complained about another bank he sent payments from, and I will refer to them as "B."

Mr J realised he'd been scammed after he tried to access his funds but was told they had been seized. He complained to Revolut who said they displayed warning messages for some of the payments being made. They said Mr J acknowledged the warnings and was happy for them to proceed.

Because of the action taken, and as some of the payments were made to an account in Mr J's own name, Revolut were unable to agree they had done anything wrong and therefore didn't refund the loss.

Mr J brought his complaint to our service. Our Investigator looked into everything and was of the opinion that given the payments weren't particularly unusual or suspicious in nature given the amounts, there weren't sufficient grounds for Revolut to suspect Mr J was at risk of fraud. She did however acknowledge that Revolut did intervene for some of the payments made, and that due to the responses given, she didn't find it wrong that Revolut let the payments go through.

Mr J didn't accept our Investigator's view and so the complaint has been passed to me to issue a 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.

I'm very aware that I've summarised this complaint briefly, in less detail than has been provided, and in my own words. No discourtesy is intended by this. Instead, I've focussed on what I think is the heart of the matter here. If there's something I've not mentioned, it isn't because I've ignored it. I haven't. I'm satisfied I don't need to comment on every individual point or argument to be able to reach what I think is the right outcome. Our rules allow me to do this. This simply reflects the informal nature of our service as a free alternative to the

courts.

Having considered everything, I agree with the Investigator and have decided not to uphold this complaint. I know this will come as a disappointment to Mr J, so I will explain why I have reached my decision.

It is clear in this case that Mr J has lost a lot of money. And while I do empathise with him, this doesn't automatically entitle him to a refund from Revolut. It would only be fair for me to tell Revolut to reimburse Mr J if I thought they reasonably ought to have prevented the payments, or they unreasonably hindered any recovery of the funds.

Under the Payment Services Regulations (PSRs) and the terms of the account, Mr J is presumed liable for any loss in the first instance, in circumstances where he authorises a payment. That said, in line with good industry practice, Revolut should take proactive steps to identify and help prevent transactions that appear sufficiently unusual, uncharacteristic or suspicious that could involve fraud or be the result of a scam.

However, it is important to note that there are many payments made by customers each day and so it wouldn't be realistic or reasonable to expect a bank to stop and check every payment. There is a balance to be struck between identifying payments that could potentially be fraudulent and minimising any disruption to genuine and legitimate payments.

Here, I can see that Mr J made multiple payments into his own account with another provider, and one payment overseas. Having considered the amounts and when the payments were made, I don't find they were particularly unusual or suspicious in character which meant they should have triggered any suspicion.

While there are many scams involving cryptocurrency, I wouldn't have expected Revolut to have treated any of the payments suspiciously. The majority of the payments were made to Mr J's own account with another provider, and the one payment that was made overseas wasn't one that I would expect to flag as suspicious. As a service, we cannot expect banks to stop every transaction as it wouldn't be feasible, and a lot of them are in fact genuine.

I can see that Revolut did however intervene on some of the payments made, where Mr J could have selected that he was making them towards an investment. However, he said he was transferring money to another account of his, that he was completing the transactions by himself and that he hadn't been asked to download any software. While this wasn't wholly inaccurate, the overall purpose for the payments was so they could be paid towards an investment. Had Mr J said he was making the payments for investment purposes, the relevant warnings could have been provided.

So overall, I don't believe any of the payments should have triggered on Revolut's systems, nor do I feel they warranted any intervention. Revolut did however intervene, and I don't find it unreasonable that they let the payments go through given the answers that were provided.

It is also important to remember that Revolut would not have been aware of what was being done on any other accounts. I can only assess what each business knew about the activity on the accounts they held for Mr J at the time.

However, for completeness, even if I were to say that Revolut could have done more, it's worth noting that Mr J looks to have been influenced by the scammer. I have read through the conversations that took place and can see that even when sceptical, Mr J placed a high level of trust in the scammer and followed their instruction. Mr J followed the scammer's guidance on how to send the money and also told them that a payment had been flagged by Revolut meaning he may therefore need to send them in smaller amounts. I therefore find it most likely that even if Revolut had intervened further, Mr J would have proceeded with the payments.

Given everything, while firms do have a duty to look out for payments that may be evidence that a customer is falling for a scam, I am satisfied the payments here, along with the responses given by Mr J when intervention did take place, wouldn't have flagged as suspicious. Because of this, I'm not able to ask either Revolut to reimburse the money lost.

Recovery

I also need to consider whether Revolut did enough after being advised of the scam, to try and recover the funds.

I can see that Revolut tried to recover the funds that had been lost but unfortunately weren't able to as they had already been removed.

For the payments made to accounts in Mr J's own name, had any funds remained, he would have had access to those himself. However no funds would have remained as they had already been sent on to the scammer.

Overall, while I strongly empathise with Mr J and what he has been through, I don't think Revolut are responsible for the losses he has suffered. So, while I know this will come as a disappointment, I don't think Revolut have acted unfairly by not refunding him.

My final decision

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 J to accept or reject my decision before 15 January 2026.

Danielle Padden
Ombudsman