

The complaint

Mr L has complained about how Revolut Ltd (Revolut) handled a refund claim he made to them.

What happened

- In December 2024, Mr L purchased two items from an online marketplace (which I'll refer to as 'F') using his debit card— a game console to the sum of £109.99 and a heater to the sum of £49.99.
- However Mr L found that his game console wouldn't turn on a month later but was told by the marketplace seller that returns wouldn't be accepted as it was outside the 30 day return window. They did offer to help address the issue, however Mr L considered that he was entitled to return the console.
- In terms of the heater purchase, Mr L said that it had faulty wheels and asked for a return. While the seller offered a replacement of a wheel, F said that Mr L started the return process but that was never completed.
- In both cases F didn't think a refund was due to Mr L as they hadn't done anything wrong. As Mr L didn't agree, he contacted Revolut to raise chargeback claims against F.
- Revolut considered both of Mr L's chargeback claims but didn't progress them further based on F's submissions as they didn't consider there was a prospect of success if they'd done so.
- Mr L didn't agree and complained about the handling of both of his chargeback claims. Revolut issued their final response letter (FRL) in March 2025 confirming their position that they didn't think they'd done anything wrong in the administration of these claims. As Mr L didn't agree, he brought his complaint to this service.
- Our investigator considered the available evidence and reached the same conclusions as Revolut. They also didn't think Revolut needed to do anything further regarding his customer service complaints tied to the chargeback claims.
- Mr L didn't agree and asked for an ombudsman to issue a final decision on the matter.

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 won't comment on all aspects of the complaint – I'll focus on the main parts that are relevant to my decision.

It's important to note that Revolut aren't the provider of the goods here – so in deciding what is fair and reasonable, I'm looking at their particular role as a provider of financial services. In doing so I note that because Mr L paid for this transaction using a Revolut debit card, a chargeback claim could possibly help him. So in deciding what is fair and reasonable I've focussed on this.

Chargeback

Chargeback is the process by which settlement disputes are resolved between card issuers and merchants. A consumer isn't entitled to chargeback by right. But where there are grounds to raise one and it has reasonable grounds for success, it is good practice for one to be raised by the card issuer.

However, a chargeback isn't guaranteed to succeed and is governed by the limitations of the particular card scheme rules (in this case VISA). I've considered the relevant chargeback rules in deciding whether Revolut acted fairly for each of these claims and I've set them out below in turn.

Chargeback for the game console

- On 28 February 2025, Mr L contacted Revolut to raise a chargeback claim regarding his handheld game console purchase from December 2024. He said that his console no longer turned on and the seller wasn't willing to accept a return.
- Revolut raised a chargeback claim under reason code 'Merchandise / Services Not Received' which doesn't seem the most appropriate reason here as he did receive the goods. 'Not as Described or Defective Merchandise / Services' would've been most appropriate so I've considered it under this reason code.
- However, a chargeback isn't guaranteed to succeed and it can be defended by the merchant.
- In this case the merchant explained why it was refusing to concede the chargeback. They said Mr L left a positive review about his purchase and only stated there were issues with the item ten weeks later.
- They also provided a picture of the handheld console at the time of the sale and a picture Mr L sent when the console no longer turned on. This showed it had considerable wear and tear during the weeks after delivery to the point Mr L had these issues.
- Revolut considered the merchant's submissions and declined the claim as they considered there wasn't a prospect of success if it was taken further.
- It's important to note that Revolut doesn't decide who wins or loses a chargeback. However Revolut could've taken the chargeback further and potentially pushed it to arbitration by the card scheme.
- However, looking at the circumstances, it appears there wasn't a reasonable prospect of success here. I say this because the nature of the dispute and the submission by F means there are doubts as to how the card scheme would be able

to effectively arbitrate in Mr L's favour here. While Mr L has said that the console stopped working, not only is it outside F's time limits for returns but the console picture shows considerable wear within the ten weeks it was used.

- In addition the merchant also offered to help troubleshoot the issue. With all of this in mind, I don't think there is enough to say Mr L would likely have got a positive outcome here had the chargeback progressed further.
- So I think Revolut weren't acting unreasonably in not progressing the chargeback further as it didn't have a reasonable prospect of success based on the evidence available.

Chargeback for the heater

- On 4 March 2025, Mr L contacted Revolut to also raise a claim regarding a heater purchase via F in December 2024. He said that the wheels were faulty and so he wanted to arrange a return.
- However F said that while Mr L initiated the return process, this wasn't completed and the item was never returned to the seller. As a result they didn't think a refund was due here.
- Mr L's correspondence with the seller also shows they asked for more details about the issue and arranged to send a replacement wheel. While Mr L responded stating he needed two sets of wheels, evidence of further communication hasn't been provided. So in this case the seller attempted to rectify the issue and while F has said Mr L did initiate the return process, the item wasn't returned.
- The most appropriate chargeback code here would be 'Not as Described or Defective Merchandise / Services' again. Revolut declined the claim here and felt there wasn't a prospect of success had it progressed further.
- I would agree and say this because, once again, it's difficult to determine how F would effectively arbitrate in Mr L's favour here. Mr L did provide photos of the wheels and while they aren't clear, it looks like the wheels may have detached from the heater.
- The seller did offer to send replacements but despite this there are screenshots from F's site showing the return process starting but then being closed as the item wasn't returned. So there is sufficient evidence to show that the seller attempted to address the issue, and in addition Mr L didn't return the item to F within the required time.
- With consideration of these submissions, I don't think there is enough to say Mr L would've had a positive outcome here either, had the chargeback progressed to arbitration. I therefore can't agree that Revolut were acting unreasonably here either in not progressing the chargeback further.

Customer Service

- Mr L has also complained about the general handling of his claims. Revolut has stated in their submissions that Mr L was informed that he needed to submit further evidence regarding his claims through their app and this was considered as soon as possible.

- I've insufficient evidence of any delays with the claim process although I note Revolut's final response letter of 7 March 2025 does highlight the fact that when the game console chargeback claim was first submitted on 28 February 2025, it was cancelled on the same day due to lack of evidence. Mr L asked for it to be resubmitted but technical difficulties prevented this from occurring until a few days later.
- I see Revolut has apologised for this and I can't say the delay was of a significant length and would require anything further from them to address this. Likewise Revolut were correct in saying the disputes couldn't be reopened here at Mr L's request as outcomes had been reached in both cases.
- Lastly Mr L was also unhappy he didn't receive temporary credits for the chargeback claims while they were being looked at. In any event the refund would've been re-debited once the claim was unsuccessful and so I've insufficient evidence this was of detriment to Mr L.

While I do note in the online chat that Mr L did suggest he was suffering from financial difficulties, I don't think a temporary refund would've helped as it would've been re-debited at the end of the claim if it had been unsuccessful. Mr L needed to discuss his circumstances with Revolut in terms of the administration of his account beyond the discussions of these chargeback claims for any support but I can't see this occurred. Mr L should speak to Revolut however if he is struggling financially and needs to discuss this further.

Regarding his complaint however, I can't say that Revolut need do anything more here regarding their general handling of the claims.

My final decision

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

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr L to accept or reject my decision before 16 October 2025.

Viral Patel
Ombudsman