

## **The complaint**

Mr D complains that Revolut Ltd has declined to reimburse payments made as part of a scam.

## **What happened**

In August 2023, Mr D received a call from a scammer impersonating Revolut and another of his banking providers. He was persuaded that there was fraud on his account and that he needed to move his funds to a holding account. In total Mr D is disputing over £100,000 sent from his account over three days – the payments were a mixture of card payments and transfers. Mr D realised he'd lost his money when his son prompted him to check his account and he noticed the payments went to different individuals.

Revolut declined to reimburse Mr D on the basis that it considered the payments authorised. It also said it had provided Mr D with warnings at the time and he had provided inaccurate information to it about the payments.

When Mr D referred the complaint to our service, the investigator didn't uphold it. In summary while they thought Revolut ought to have done more to intervene, they didn't think this would have prevented Mr D's loss. They didn't think Revolut could have recovered Mr D's funds.

Mr D didn't agree, he said he wasn't dishonest and had provided answers based on instructions from the scammers believing this was part of the process to move his funds to a special account. Mr D also raised the delay in Revolut providing information about chargebacks.

## **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'm not upholding this complaint for similar reasons to the investigator.

It's common ground that Mr D was tricked into authorising the disputed payments as part of a safe account scam. Essentially, Mr D made all the bank transfers and confirmed the card payments in his Revolut banking app under the coaching of scammers believing he needed to move his funds to a new holding account for safekeeping. This means that the starting position is that Revolut can hold Mr D liable for the payments.

### Did Revolut miss an opportunity to prevent Mr D's loss?

An Electronic Money Institution ("EMI") such as Revolut is expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make, in accordance with the PSRs and the terms and conditions of the customer's account.

But, taking into account longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements, and what I consider to be good industry practice, Revolut ought to have been on the look-out for the

possibility of fraud and made additional checks before processing payments in some circumstances.

Here there were a significant number of high value payments being made at pace, so I consider that Revolut ought to have recognised that Mr D was at heightened risk of financial harm from fraud. While Revolut did intervene in the transfers, I think it ought to have intervened sooner than this, and that it would have been proportionate for an agent at Revolut to have had a discussion with Mr D about the payments. I also think Revolut ought to have gone further than it did in the discussions that it did have with Mr D, to better establish the circumstances surrounding the payments.

However, for it to be fair for me to make an award on this basis I would need to conclude that if it had intervened appropriately, it likely would have been able to identify the scam Mr D had fallen victim to and been able to prevent his loss. I don't think that's the case here.

Unfortunately, the scammer was able to build trust with Mr D and exploited the sense of panic they had created. So, under coaching from the scammer Mr D was persuaded to follow their instructions, and to give incorrect information to Revolut in the banking app. During the scam, when Revolut did intervene in the transfers, it asked Mr D questions about them. Mr D confirmed that he wasn't being assisted in making the payments, when this wasn't accurate. He also selected that the payment purpose was to "Buy or rent goods or services" in relation to a property, confirmed he had met the agent, and confirmed he had seen the property in person. Revolut provided warnings that it could be a scam and emphasised the importance of answering its questions truthfully. It also entered a live chat with Mr D in-app where further warnings were presented that were relevant to the payment purpose he had given, but Mr D continued to make the payments. Based on the information Revolut had, I don't think it could reasonably have identified the scam Mr D had fallen victim to, so it couldn't tailor the warnings in a way that made them meaningful to Mr D.

Mr D has explained that he was told how to answer these questions by the scammer under the belief that this was the quickest way to make the payments and secure his funds. He said that he was told not to mention he was being guided as this could alert any fraudsters. I understand Mr D was manipulated by the scammer into misleading Revolut and I'm not making a judgement on his character. The issue I must decide here is not whether Mr D thought he had good reason to mislead Revolut. But rather whether I think that if Revolut had discussed the payments sooner and in more depth with Mr D, as I think it should have, it's likely this would have prevented any further loss. On balance, I think it's more likely than not that Mr D would have continued to provide misleading answers if Revolut had asked more open or probing questions. And so, I'm not persuaded that this would have likely led to Revolut identifying the scam Mr D had fallen victim to or prevented Mr D from making the payments.

I appreciate Mr D thinks that if he'd been able to speak to Revolut on the phone, things might have been different. But Revolut is an app-based provider, and so it's normal method for agents to discuss payments with a customer would have been through the app.

For the reasons explained, I'm not persuaded that a proportionate intervention by Revolut would have prevented Mr D's loss, and so I don't think it would be fair to require it to reimburse the payments on this basis.

Could Revolut have done anything else to recover Mr D's money?

Some of the payments were faster payments i.e. transfers. Revolut did raise a claim to the receiving bank requesting any available funds be returned, unfortunately none were available to recover.

Regarding the disputed card payments, the recovery option that would have been available to Revolut was through the chargeback scheme. The process is set by the card scheme provider to resolve payment disputes between customers and merchants – subject to the rules they set. As the scheme is voluntary and limited in scope, Revolut wouldn't be expected to raise a claim that it thought had no prospect of success. I do appreciate Revolut may have caused confusion bringing this option up some time after the initial scam reporting. But based on how the card payments were authorised, a fraud chargeback would be unlikely to succeed had it been raised at the time. And so I don't think this has caused Mr D any financial loss.

I'm sorry that Mr D has been the victim of a cruel scam, and I do appreciate this has had a significant impact on him. For the reasons explained, I don't think Revolut needs to do anything further in relation to the matter.

### **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 D to accept or reject my decision before 14 October 2025.

Stephanie Mitchell  
**Ombudsman**