

The complaint

Mrs T, via a representative, has complained that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) failed to refund the money she lost as part of an investment scam.

What happened

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties, so I will not repeat everything again here. Instead, I will focus on giving the reasons for my decision.

In summary though, Mrs T found an advert for an investment firm on a social media site that appeared to fronted by a well-known celebrity. I will call this firm B.

Mrs T made a number of payments to B between December 2023 and April 2024. These payments originated from a different current account provider. The payments that Mrs T has complained about in relation to Revolut is 4 transfers that went from Mrs T's Revolut account to what appears to be an account with an international bank. The payments were as follows and were made in Euros:

Transaction Number	Date	Amount	Type of payment
1	28 December 2023	€12,500	Transfer
2	8 January 2024	€34,956.68	Transfer
3	10 January 2024	€11,596.20	Transfer
4	18 January 2024	€23,250	Transfer

Mrs T initially reported that she had been scammed shortly after payment 4 but then withdrew her scam claim saying that she had been reassured by B. She continued to send funds to B after this point from an account she held with a different provider. She realised in April 2024 that she had been scammed.

One of our investigators looked into this matter and he thought that any intervention from Revolut would not have stopped the scam. He said this because Mrs T did not give accurate answers to Revolut and her other account providers when questioned about the payments. He therefore did not uphold this complaint.

Mrs T did not agree with this and therefore her complaint has been passed to me to issue a 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.

Having done so, I agree with the conclusions reached by the investigator for the following reasons.

In deciding what's fair and reasonable, I am required to take into account relevant law and regulations, regulators' rules, guidance and standards, and codes of practice; and, where appropriate, I must also take into account what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time.

Where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive or contradictory (as some of it is here), I reach my decision on the balance of probabilities – in other words, on what I consider is more likely to have (or would have) happened, in light of the available evidence and the wider circumstances.

In broad terms, the starting position is that Revolut is expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make. This should be in accordance with the Payment Services Regulations and the terms and conditions of the customer's account.

However, taking into account relevant law, regulatory rules and guidance, relevant codes of practice and what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time, I consider it fair and reasonable that Revolut should:

- have been monitoring accounts and any payments made or received to counter various risks, including preventing fraud and scams;
- have had systems in place to look out for unusual transactions or other signs that might indicate that its customers were at risk of fraud (among other things). This is particularly so given the increase in sophisticated fraud and scams in recent years, which firms are generally more familiar with than the average customer;
- have acted to avoid causing foreseeable harm to customers, for example by maintaining adequate systems to detect and prevent scams and by ensuring all aspects of its products, including the contractual terms, enabled it to do so;
- in some circumstances, irrespective of the payment channel used, have taken additional steps, or made additional checks, or provided additional warnings, before processing a payment – (as in practice Revolut sometimes does); and
- have been mindful of – among other things – common scam scenarios, how the fraudulent practices are evolving (including for example the common use of multi-stage fraud by scammers, including the use of payments to cryptocurrency accounts as a step to defraud consumers) and the different risks these can present to consumers, when deciding whether to intervene.

I think that Revolut should have intervened when Mrs T made her first payment and I can see that it did. I think an appropriate intervention would have been a human intervention with questions being asked about the payment. I can see that Revolut did intervene and attempted to provide a tailored written warning based on the answers provided by Mrs T. I can see that Mrs T did not provide accurate answers as to what the payments related to, so the warning provided did not relate to the type of scam that Mrs T was falling for. So I don't think a human intervention during this payment would have stopped the scam.

I say this because Mrs T seems to have been aware that, if she gave accurate answers as to what she was doing, her payments might be stopped. This is demonstrated by her providing misleading answers as to what the payments related to. Some examples of this are that she told Revolut she was buying goods for a business that she had started overseas, she even provided an invoice to show what she was doing.

I think that Revolut should have intervened again later. But given that Mrs T repeatedly misled all her current account providers when questioned about the payments, I don't think that this would have uncovered or prevented the scam. I think it's likely that Mrs T would have continued to mislead Revolut as well.

Ultimately, Revolut was only required to take proportionate steps to try and protect Mrs T from financial harm. I'm not persuaded she would've shared anything concerning with Revolut, had it questioned her more about what she was doing. So overall I think that Revolut should have intervened more than it did. But I do not think that this would have likely stopped or uncovered the scam.

I note that Mrs T initially said that she had been scammed in January 2024. But given that on the same day she withdrew this claim, I don't think that Revolut needed to do anything more. I also note that no more payments were sent directly to the scammer from this account after this event.

I've also thought about whether Revolut could have done more to recover the funds after Mrs T reported the fraud. I can see as soon as Mrs T actually pursued a scam claim in April 2024, Revolut attempted to recover the funds. Revolut did not receive a response from the receiving bank and I don't think that it needed to do anything more.

I appreciate this will likely come as a disappointment to Mrs T, and I'm sorry to hear she has been the victim of a cruel scam. However, whilst I have a great deal of sympathy for the situation that Mrs T found herself in, I'm not persuaded that Revolut can fairly or reasonably be held liable for her loss in these circumstances.

My final decision

For the reasons given above, I do not uphold this complaint

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs T to accept or reject my decision before 22 October 2025.

Charlie Newton
Ombudsman