

## The complaint

Mr R complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund him money he lost in an investment scam and an impersonation scam.

Mr R is being represented by a professional representative, but for ease of reading I'll just refer to Mr R.

## What happened

The circumstances surrounding this complaint are well-known to both parties, so I have simply summarised what I consider to be the key points.

Mr R says he saw an advert for an investment on social media. It appeared to be endorsed by a well-known celebrity and Mr R was interested in investing, so he gave his contact details and was promptly contacted over a popular messaging application.

He was given some further details about the investment and he says he did some research on review websites, but found nothing negative or suspicious and so he decided to invest.

He was advised to set up an account with Revolut and says he was taken through the process of setting up a trading account. He made a small investment initially and invested more when he saw a reasonable profit had been made. After some months he decided to withdraw some money from his investment, but he was told he would need to pay fees and it was around this point he realised he had been the victim of a scam.

Some weeks later, at the end of November 2023, Mr R was contacted by someone purporting to be able to recover his money. He paid some initial fees and was told that his money had been located but he would need to pay some more fees to release it. He paid these additional fees, but once again he was told he would need to pay even more fees and at that point he realised he had been scammed once more.

Mr R made the following transactions as part of these scams:

Date	Amount	Payment type	Destination
28/03/2023	£400	Card Payment	Company A
01/04/2023	£230	Card Payment	Company B
05/04/2023	£800	Card Payment	Cryptocurrency wallet
11/04/2023	£1,000	Card Payment	Cryptocurrency wallet
31/05/2023	£3,600	Card Payment	Cryptocurrency wallet
02/06/2023	£15	Card Payment	Cryptocurrency wallet
06/07/2023	£4,050	Card Payment	Cryptocurrency wallet
02/08/2023	£5,000	Card Payment	Cryptocurrency wallet
02/08/2023	£1,000	Card Payment	Cryptocurrency wallet
01/09/2023	£4,000	Card Payment	Cryptocurrency wallet
04/10/2023	£3,500	Card Payment	Cryptocurrency wallet
19/12/2023	£600	Bank Transfer	Cryptocurrency wallet
19/12/2023	£500	Bank Transfer	Cryptocurrency wallet

20/12/2023	£1,000	Card Payment	Cryptocurrency wallet
21/12/2023	£600	Bank Transfer	Cryptocurrency wallet
21/12/2023	£650	Bank Transfer	Cryptocurrency wallet
21/12/2023	£600	Bank Transfer	Cryptocurrency wallet

Mr R says Revolut failed to intervene to try and prevent him from becoming the victim of a scam. It didn't provide him with any effective warnings. He considers Revolut ought to have intervened because his Revolut account was newly opened and he was making large payments to cryptocurrency. This combination of factors was suspicious and ought to have triggered intervention from Revolut.

Revolut says Mr R didn't do enough research before investing. It says it did provide in-app warnings, which Mr R ignored. Revolut says it was not possible to recover Mr R's money as the card payments were completed money order payments, where the payment would have been considered to have been correctly completed once funds were credited to the payee's account.

Our investigator didn't uphold Mr R's complaint. While he thought Revolut ought to have intervened and asked questions about some of the payments, providing suitable warnings based on Mr R's answers, he didn't think any interventions would have prevented Mr R's losses. This is because Mr R's bank intervened on 4 April 2023 and discussed an attempted payment to Revolut. It asked Mr R questions about that payment and provided him with warnings about investment scams. Mr R wasn't honest in the answers he gave to his bank. Mr R's bank ultimately refused to unblock his account or make the payment. It said it thought he might be falling victim to an investment scam. This resulted in Mr R closing his account with his bank, changing banks and making payments to Revolut and ultimately on to the scammers. The investigator thought if Revolut had intervened, Mr R was unlikely to have been honest with it and Mr R would have found a way to make the payments.

Mr R didn't accept the investigator's recommendations. While he accepted he hadn't been honest with his bank, he said this was due to the sophisticated nature of the scam and his vulnerable state. Revolut ought to have intervened due to the size of some of the payments made. He said that clear, human intervention from Revolut could have worked and prevented his losses.

As Mr R didn't accept the investigator's assessment, the complaint has been passed to me for an ombudsman's 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 taken into account longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements, and what I consider to be good industry practice, I agree Revolut ought to have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and made additional checks before processing payments in some circumstances.

There were several opportunities for Revolut to have intervened. I consider the payment on 31 May 2023 ought to have led Revolut to intervene. It was a reasonably large payment, to a well-known cryptocurrency provider, on an account that had been open for around two months and had seen few transactions other than payments to a cryptocurrency provider. I consider that the payments on 6 July, 2 August, 1 September and 4 October were also sufficiently unusual that Revolut ought to have intervened.

However, I'm not persuaded that any intervention from Revolut would have prevented Mr R's losses. This is because I've listened to the call recording of the conversation Mr R had with his bank on 4 April 2023, which was unsuccessful in preventing Mr R's losses and it leads me to conclude that similar calls from Revolut would probably have been equally unsuccessful. During that call, Mr R's bank asked Mr R a series of questions about why he was making a £5,000 payment to Revolut but Mr R wasn't open with Revolut about his reasons. His bank warned him about investment scams and how it thought the pattern of transactions was indicative of fraud. Mr R said the payment wasn't intended for an investment, he said no one had contacted him about investing and said that he was making the payment to send money to a relative overseas. None of this was the case though. The bank blocked the payment and Mr R's account and this resulted in him closing his bank account and opening another, through which he was able to transfer funds that were ultimately sent on to the scammers.

Mr R acknowledges that he didn't provide honest answers to his bank but has suggested that human intervention from Revolut could have been successful. He also suggested that he wasn't honest with his bank due to the sophisticated nature of the scam and due to vulnerabilities. Mr R hasn't explained how the sophisticated nature of the scam led him to be dishonest with his bank nor any detail about his vulnerability.

But the call with his bank was very clear. He was given an explanation about how the bank had seen investment scams where the payments looked similar to the payments on his account and he was asked clear questions about the payment. Given that Mr R didn't respond to human intervention from his bank, I see little reason to conclude that such intervention from Revolut would have been any more successful and Mr R's actions of closing his bank account and setting up another to facilitate the payments suggests to me that he was determined to proceed with the investment despite his bank's warnings.

It was only some time after the 4 October 2023 transaction that Mr R says he realised he had been scammed and he says all these payments were made in the belief he was still investing. So, I don't think Mr R would have had any doubts or acted differently if Revolut had intervened on any of these occasions.

On balance, while I don't consider Revolut did all it could have done, I'm not persuaded intervention from Revolut would have prevented Mr R's loss.

### Recovery

Revolut suggests it didn't pursue attempts to recover Mr R's money because he didn't provide it with all the information it needed, such as evidence of loss, evidence of contact with the scammers and details of any money he might have received back. Mr R says he provided Revolut with what he had.

In any event, I'm not persuaded that there was any reasonable prospect of Revolut being able to recover Mr R's money. The card payments were made to a cryptocurrency wallet and the payments would have been considered to have been properly completed when funds credited the wallet Mr R had instructed Revolut to send his money to. Under the relevant card scheme rules, successful chargebacks wouldn't have been possible in these circumstances. Other card payments appear to have been made for education services, which it appears were provided, so it seems unlikely chargebacks would have been successful.

Some money was sent by bank transfer, but Mr R indicates that the money sent to the cryptocurrency wallet was sent straight on to the scammers to credit his investment account.

So, it seems highly unlikely there would have been any funds remaining in the cryptocurrency wallet for Revolut to attempt to recover, particularly as Mr R didn't report the scam until May 2024, several months after the last transaction took place.

In terms of the payments made to the second cryptocurrency wallet, which were paid as part of an impersonation scam, again, I consider it highly unlikely any money would have remained available so many months later.

While I'm not persuaded Revolut did all it could have done to attempt recovery of Mr R's money, for the reasons given, I'm not persuaded there was a reasonable prospect of recovering it.

### **My final decision**

I don't uphold Mr R's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr R to accept or reject my decision before 28 October 2025.

Greg Barham  
**Ombudsman**