

The complaint

Mr R is unhappy that Revolut Ltd won't reimburse money he lost to a scam.

Mr R is represented by a third party, but for ease of reference I will refer to Mr R throughout the decision.

What happened

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties, so I won't repeat everything here.

In summary, Mr R fell victim to a cryptocurrency investment scam. Mr R said he found the investment opportunity online which he said was endorsed by a well-known public figure. As a result, he made contact with the investment company (which I will refer to as "C").

As part of the scam, Mr R was asked to open a new account with Revolut. He also advised the scammers helped him to set up an account on C's platform using remote access software.

Mr R has advised following the scammers instruction he moved funds from his account with his bank (which I will refer to as "L") to his Revolut account, and then onto a genuine cryptocurrency provider. I understand his money was then converted into cryptocurrency and sent to the scammer.

Mr R advised the scammer took out loans in his name which he wasn't happy about. He raised this with the scammer and shortly after this the scammer stopped all contact with him. It was at this point he realised that he had been scammed.

Mr R has said the payments were sent to the scammers in March 2023 and that he lost a total of £91,905.69 as a result of the scam.

Mr R raised a complaint with Revolut. It investigated the complaint but didn't uphold it. It didn't think it had done anything wrong by allowing the payments to go through. So, Mr R brought his complaint to our service.

Our Investigator looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. Our Investigator thought that some of the payments leaving Mr R's account were concerning and that Revolut should have intervened on them. However, he didn't think it would have made a difference to Mr R's decision to send the payments. This is because L had discussed transfers he made in relation to the scam with Mr R and he had provided inaccurate information about the payments. So, the Investigator didn't feel that an intervention from Revolut would have made a difference in the circumstances.

Mr R didn't agree with the outcome, so his complaint has been passed to me for review and 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 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 have not mentioned, it isn't because I have ignored it. I haven't. I'm satisfied that 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.

I've thought about the Contingent Reimbursement Model Code (CRM Code) which can offer a potential means of obtaining a refund following scams like this one. But as Revolut isn't a signatory of the CRM Code, these payments aren't covered under it. I've therefore considered whether Revolut should reimburse Mr R under any of its other obligations.

In line with the Payment Services Regulations 2017, consumers are generally liable for payments they authorise. Revolut is expected to process authorised payment instructions without undue delay. Mr R has raised some concerns about not being aware of the payments made from his account but having reviewed the evidence provided by both parties and the information provided by L, I am satisfied that Mr R was aware of the payments being made to the scam.

I think it's important to note here that although Mr R has provided chats he had with the scammer, we have not been provided with evidence to show what then happened to the funds after they were sent to the cryptocurrency provider, or that they were subsequently lost to the scammers. Generally, I would expect to see some more evidence to link the disputed payments to a scam, before considering if Revolut should have done anything else to intervene in the payments. However, I don't think this makes a difference to the outcome of Mr R's complaint because, like the Investigator, I don't think an intervention from Revolut would have made a difference to Mr R's decision to send the payments. So, I'm going to proceed on the basis that Mr R did suffer a loss to the scam he's described.

Taking into account relevant law, regulators' 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. 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;
- 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;
- have been mindful of – among other things – common scam scenarios, how 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've considered whether there was anything about the circumstances surrounding the payment that could have put Revolut on notice that it was being made as part of a scam. And I think there was.

As I've explained above, Revolut should have had appropriate systems for providing warnings and carrying out further enquiries before it processed such payments. So, I've gone on to consider, taking into account what Revolut knew about the payments, at what point, if any, there ought to have been a concern that Mr R was at a heightened risk of fraud. And if so, whether it should have intervened, for example by providing an online written warning, or by contacting Mr R directly, before releasing the payments. But I'd expect any intervention to be proportionate to the circumstances of the payment.

Mr R's account had been opened a few days prior to the payments in dispute. Revolut believe that there wasn't sufficient payment history to regard the payments as unusual and it has confirmed it didn't provide Mr R with any warnings on the payments he made. But it did have some information, such as Mr R's reasons for opening the account and the destination of the payments, that it could have considered. And I agree with the Investigator that Revolut should have been concerned about the £1,000 payment Mr R made from his account on 15 March 2023. This was the third payment being made to a cryptocurrency provider that day. The previous payments had all been made in quick succession so I think it should have raised concerns with Revolut. In the circumstances Revolut should reasonably have taken steps to warn Mr R of the risk before the payment went ahead.

Mr R insists that an intervention from Revolut would have prevented his losses. Where something didn't happen that should have, I'm required to make this decision based on the balance of probabilities; that is, what I find is more likely than not to have happened if things had gone as they should. I've carefully considered all of the available evidence. But having done so, I'm not persuaded that a warning, had it been given, would have made a difference to Mr R's decision to go ahead with the payment above or any subsequent payments. This is because I have listened to calls Mr R had with L where he discussed a number of payments he was transferring to his Revolut account to help fund the scam. In these calls Mr R provided inaccurate information about the payments he was making, so on balance, I don't think he would have revealed the true purpose behind his transfers if Revolut had intervened on the payments. I have included my thoughts on this below:

- Mr R advised he was using the payments for home improvements – he confirmed this in a number of calls despite knowing the payments would be used to fund the investment.
- In one call Mr R explained that the Revolut account had been open a while. He highlighted on a number of occasions why he would prefer to use his Revolut account, rather than L and that he wanted to keep all things in relation to the home improvements on that account. He also described being offered better benefits on the Revolut account.
- He also explained to L that he had opened the Revolut account himself, that he hadn't received help from anyone or been asked to open it. He was asked about these points in a number of calls.
- He confirmed that he hadn't been told to lie to L and that he hadn't been asked to make any transfers by anyone else.
- Mr R confirmed he had applied loans and had completed the applications independently.
- He's asked if he has access to the Revolut account and he confirmed that he did. When payments are released by L into the account he confirms that they have been received.
- L provided a number of scam warnings and highlighted that he may not get his

- money back if this turns out to be a scam.
- In one call Mr R is directed to a branch as L was concerned that Mr R may be falling victim to a scam. Mr R advised he was there for several hours and that he discussed his payments with the police. L confirmed it was happy with the information Mr R shared about the payments, following the visit from the police so it unblocked the transaction.

It's clear that Mr R trusted what he was being told by the scammers about the investment and that he was willing to provide inaccurate information in order to get the payments processed. I think Mr R was sadly very much under the spell of the scammers. And so, considering Mr R continued to hide the true reasons for the payments from the police and L, I find it highly unlikely that he would've disclosed them to Revolut irrespective of how bespoke or tailored its questioning could have been. I'm therefore not persuaded Revolut could have uncovered that Mr R was falling for a scam had it intervened and asked the questions I would have expected it to.

On balance, I believe that Mr R would have answered the questions in a way which allowed the payments to go through, as he had done with L and the police. In those circumstances I don't think it would be fair to ask Revolut to refund Mr R's disputed payments.

I'm aware Mr R has said Revolut ought to have been aware that victims may be coached. And that Revolut should have also taken into consideration Mr R's age – as this made him potentially vulnerable to falling victim to the scam. While I agree that Revolut should be mindful of these factors, I cannot reasonably ignore the responses Mr R provided to L when questioned about the payments. I also wouldn't expect a firm to interrogate a customer when assessing whether they had been coached. And having listened to the calls with L, I don't think there was anything within those calls which would have put a firm on notice that he might be vulnerable due to his age.

I also understand that Mr R was experiencing some difficult circumstances at the time he fell victim to the scam and that falling for it has also impacted his health. He's shared details about his ongoing health challenges. I'm sorry to learn about this and I thank him for sharing this information with us. But I can't say that Revolut was or should have been aware that he was vulnerable or made any special adjustments for him at the time the transactions were made.

Mr R has also requested compensation in addition to a refund of the scam payments made. But I can't see any reason which would suggest compensation is warranted in the circumstances of the complaint as I have not found anything to suggest Revolut have acted incorrectly.

I'm also not persuaded Revolut could have done anything more to recover Mr R's funds. I say this because the payments were sent from Revolut to a cryptocurrency account in Mr R's name and then moved onto the scammers. So, I don't think there was any realistic prospect of Revolut recovering the funds.

My final decision

For the reasons I have explained, I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr R to accept or reject my decision before 26 November 2025.

Aleya Khanom

Ombudsman