

## **The complaint**

Mr V complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund money he lost to a scam.

## **What happened**

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties and so I'll only refer to some key events here.

In July 2025 Mr V was contacted by a person claiming to work for his other banking provider's fraud department (which I'll refer to as 'H'). We now know this to be a scam. Mr V was told his H account was compromised and that he needed to move his funds to a secure account. Mr V followed the scammer's instructions and moved funds from his H account to his Revolut account. From there, a £3,500 debit card payment was made to a merchant I'll refer to as 'B'. Mr V has said he was manipulated into making this transaction by the scammer.

Mr V reported what happened to Revolut and raised a complaint as he wanted to be reimbursed his loss. Revolut rejected the complaint and wouldn't refund Mr V.

The complaint was referred to the Financial Ombudsman. Our Investigator didn't think Revolut had to do anything further. He said Revolut carried out additional checks and provided warnings relevant to Mr V's situation before processing the £3,500 payment that he considered were proportionate to the risks associated with it. Unfortunately, Mr V proceeded to make the payment despite this. Our Investigator also didn't think Revolut could've done anything more to recover his funds – as the chargeback Revolut raised was rejected.

Mr V disagreed and so, the matter has been passed to me to decide.

## **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 sorry Mr V has been the victim of a scam. I appreciate it is a lot of money he has lost. But I must consider if Revolut is responsible for it. While I know this will come as a disappointment to Mr V, I don't think they are. I'll explain why.

Mr V has referenced the Contingent Reimbursement Model code (which Revolut wasn't signed up to) and the Authorised Push Payment Fraud Reimbursement Scheme that came into effect in October 2024. This scheme however doesn't cover the transaction Mr V is disputing here – as it doesn't include debit card payments. I've therefore considered whether it would otherwise be fair and reasonable to hold Revolut responsible for Mr V's loss.

I understand Mr V was tricked by the scammer into processing the payment via the Revolut app – as, otherwise, he was told he could risk losing his money to hackers. But while I appreciate Mr V might not have known exactly where the funds were being sent, I'm satisfied he authorised the payment to B. Generally, consumers are liable for payments they

authorise and Revolut are also expected to process authorised payment instructions without undue delay.

However, taking into account the regulatory rules and guidance, relevant codes of practice and good industry practice, there are circumstances where it might be appropriate for Revolut to take additional steps or make additional checks before processing a payment to help protect customers from the possibility of financial harm from fraud.

At which point, I should explain that for me to find it fair and reasonable that Revolut should refund Mr V requires more than a finding that Revolut ought to have intervened. I would need to find not only that Revolut failed to intervene where they ought reasonably to have done so - but crucially I'd need to find that but for this failure the subsequent loss would've been avoided. That latter element concerns causation. A proportionate intervention will not always result in the prevention of a payment. And if I find it more likely than not that such a proportionate intervention by Revolut wouldn't have revealed the payment was part of a fraud or scam, then I couldn't fairly hold Revolut liable for not having prevented it from being made.

Here, Revolut did carry out additional checks before processing the £3,500 payment to B. As part of these checks, Revolut told Mr V that something doesn't look right and the payment had been identified by their system as a potential scam. Revolut then told Mr V that it was important for him to answer their questions about the payment honestly, and that if he was being pressurised to hide any details about the transaction he could be being scammed. Mr V acknowledged this and chose to proceed. Then, as part of Revolut's checks, he confirmed:

- He wasn't being pressured into making the payment, nobody was telling him what to say (as if they were, Revolut warned they were a scammer) and that he was completing the transaction himself
- He was transferring funds to his account with another bank. And his bank hadn't asked him to make this transaction – as Revolut warned that *“fraudsters will call pretending to be from your bank to get you to move money to a ‘safe’ account urgently”*
- He hadn't been told his account wasn't safe – as Revolut warned that *“fraudsters will lie and tell you that your account isn't safe. They'll say that you need to move your money to another account”*
- The money was going to an account he controlled

Revolut then provided several warnings, which included:

- **This could be an impersonation scam**  
STOP. Fraudsters pretend to be financial institutions and panic you to act fast.
- **Be wary of unexpected calls**  
Clever scammers can impersonate bank agents and phone numbers. If in doubt, hang up and contact the bank yourself
- **Told your account isn't safe?**

Financial institutions don't ask customers to urgently move funds. Do not transfer to an account you didn't open yourself

- **Never ignore these warnings**

Scammers will tell you to ignore warnings. If you've been told to ignore these red flags we've raised, then stop, it's a scam

Mr V acknowledged these warnings and proceeded to make the payment.

Having considered the questions Revolut asked, and the warnings they provided, I'm satisfied they were clear and tailored to Mr V's situation – specially addressing the features relevant to the scam he was falling victim to. At which point, I understand Mr V was being manipulated by the scammer and told the warnings were "*routine and that this was part of [the] bank's secure transfer protocol*". And he couldn't think rationally and assess the warnings due to the advanced social engineering techniques used by the scammer that created a heightened sense of urgency, fear and perceived danger to his funds.

I'm sympathetic to Mr V's situation as I understand that scammers use sophisticated techniques to manipulate their victims. But I can't fairly hold Revolut responsible for that. They were reliant on Mr V engaging with their additional checks – both in terms of responding positively to warnings relevant to his situation but also answering their questions honestly. Unfortunately, due to Mr V denying any third-party involvement, that he was being pressured into making the payment, or that he had been told by his bank to move the funds due to his account being unsafe, Revolut weren't able to uncover the scam. And I don't think they had enough reason to suspect Mr V was being guided by a third-party to mislead them. Because of this, I think it was reasonable for Revolut to accept the information Mr V provided in good faith.

I've carefully considered the checks Revolut carried out, and whether it was proportionate to the risks associated with the payments. When doing so, I'm mindful that there is a balance for Revolut to find between allowing customers to be able to use their account and questioning transactions to confirm they're legitimate. And so, it isn't practical for Revolut to speak with their customers before processing every payment.

I appreciate Mr V doesn't think Revolut's checks went far enough. But when considering the risks associated with the payment (including its value, destination and the information Mr V provided), I think the automated questions and warnings Revolut provided were a proportionate action in these circumstances. I therefore wouldn't have expected Revolut to have done anything more before allowing the payment to be processed.

I've considered whether, on being alerted to the scam, Revolut could've done anything more to recover Mr V's losses, but I don't think they could. The only option of recovery was via chargeback, but this didn't have any reasonable prospect of success – as the payment was authorised by Mr V, and he wouldn't have been able to evidence a breach of contract or that B had misrepresented the goods/services paid for. In any event, Revolut did attempt a chargeback, but it was unsuccessful.

I know Mr V will be disappointed by this outcome as he is the innocent victim of a scam. But it would only be fair for me to direct Revolut to refund his loss if I thought they were responsible – and I'm not persuaded that this was the case. For the above reasons, I think Revolut has acted fairly and so I'm not going to tell them to do anything further.

**My final decision**

My final decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr V to accept or reject my decision before 17 February 2026.

Daniel O'Dell  
**Ombudsman**