

The complaint

I, a limited company complains that Revolut Ltd unfairly blocked and closed its account. I also say Revolut took too long to release its account balances.

I is represented by its director, Mr T.

What happened

The detailed background of this complaint is well known to both parties. So, I'll only provide a brief overview of some of the key events here.

I had a currency business account with Revolut.

In December 2024 Revolut decided to review I's account to comply with its legal and regulatory obligations. Revolut asked I to provide information about payments made into its account from a business I will refer to as D. Revolut asked I to provide signed contracts with D, invoices, transportation documents and a completed verification form. I didn't respond so Revolut blocked I's account. Revolut reached out to I again to ask it to get in touch and provide the information it wanted.

I responded to Revolut's request on 21 January 2025 and uploaded documents via its in app-chat facility. Revolut reviewed the information and told I that no specific timeframe could be provided about how long the review would take to complete.

Revolut asked I for more information. On the 30th of January 2025, I contacted Revolut to say it had received an email instructing them to log in and provide further details, but they were unable to do so because Revolut had disabled its account. I requested clarification on what documents were required and Revolut asked I to submit the information directly in the chat.

Between 4 and 17 February 2025 I contacted Revolut to ask how much longer the review was going to take and told Revolut that the block on I's account was causing significant problems for I's business operations. I provided Revolut with additional context and paperwork regarding its transactions with D.

Revolut completed its review on 25 April 2025, and I withdrew its account balances within a few days. Following its review Revolut decided to close I's account.

I complained to Revolut and said that Revolut had taken far too long to complete its review. It said that being without access to its account funds for three months had significantly disrupted its business activities because it was unable to receive funds from buyers and pay suppliers. I also said that due to the limited updates provided by Revolut it wasn't able to provide any reassurances to its customers on when receipt of funds and payment of funds could resume. Additionally, it said 4 payments from D had been blocked which impacted I's cash flow.

In response, Revolut apologised for any inconvenience its review had caused I. But it said it hadn't done anything wrong and had closed the account in line with the terms and conditions. And had completed the review to comply with its legal and regulatory obligations.

Mr T remained unhappy and brought I's complaint to our service. He said he accepts Revolut can review an account, but the review took far too long, which impacted his business.

An investigator looked into what had happened. After reviewing all the evidence which included information Revolut had provided to our service in confidence, the investigator thought Revolut hadn't done anything wrong when it had blocked and closed I's account. And had done so in line with the account terms and its legal and regulatory obligations. He also said that he hadn't seen any evidence that Revolut had caused any delays when completing its review.

Mr T disagreed. He maintained that Revolut took far too long to complete its review, which he says made running his business difficult. He pointed out that I had provided all the information Revolut requested promptly, so the review shouldn't have taken as long as it did. And he wants compensation for being deprived access to I's funds for months.

As no agreement could be reached the matter has come 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 would add too that our rules allow us to receive evidence in confidence. We may treat evidence from financial businesses as confidential for a number of reasons – for example, if it contains information about other customers, security information or commercially sensitive information. It's then for me to decide whether it's fair to rely on evidence that only one party has seen. It's not a one-sided rule; either party to a complaint can submit evidence in confidence if they wish to, and we'll then decide if it's fair to rely on it. Here, the information is sensitive and on balance I don't believe it should be disclosed. But it's also clearly material to the issue of whether Revolut has treated I fairly. So, I'm persuaded I should take it into account when deciding the outcome of the complaint.

I can see Mr T feels very strongly about I's complaint. That's clear from what's he's said to us and to Revolut. Whilst I appreciate Mr T's frustration and how this matter has impacted his company, it's important to point out that the only thing in question here is whether Revolut has done what it should have done. I think it has and I'll explain why.

I'll deal first with Revolut's decision to block I's account. As the investigator has explained Revolut has extensive legal and regulatory responsibilities they must meet when providing account services to customers. They can broadly be summarised as a responsibility to protect persons from financial harm, and to prevent and detect financial crime. It's the bank's duty to reasonably ensure accounts are being used in the way they should and to protect the money which is held in them.

Having reviewed all the evidence, including the information that Revolut has provided to our serviced in confidence, I'm satisfied that Revolut were acting in line with its legal and regulatory obligations when it restricted I's account in January 2025 and asked Mr T to provide information about I's relationship with D. The terms and conditions also make provision for Revolut to suspend and review an account.

I understand not having access to I's account caused I and Mr T inconvenience, but it wouldn't be appropriate for me to award I compensation since I don't believe Revolut acted inappropriately in taking the actions that it did when it blocked and reviewed I's account.

Mr T has said that Revolut took far too long to complete its review. And he wants compensation for the amount of time things took. I've looked at the information Revolut has provided about what it was doing as part of its review. And I've taken into consideration what Mr T has provided about the money it received from D and its relationship with D.

Revolut blocked I's account on 21 January 2025 and completed its review on 30 April 2025. I recognise the overall time this situation took. And I accept that I's account was blocked for a long time. But I do not consider that it would be right for me to conclude it should not have taken in excess of any particular or specific timeframe. Because the bank was entitled – as a matter of principle – to do what it did.

Whilst I understand how Revolut's actions impacted Mr T and I, given everything I've seen I can't say there were any undue delays in Revolut releasing I's closing balance and in it completing its review. I've looked at what Revolut were doing during the time I's account was blocked. Having done so, I'm satisfied that Revolut were proactive in completing its review, which included having to complete administrative processes to comply with its legal and regulatory obligations. So, I can't conclude Revolut have treated I unfairly in taking the time it did to review I's account.

Revolut are also able to set their own procedures, including how they wish to conduct their reviews. Revolut has explained that when requesting additional information this can prompt a further request and clarification, which can lead to some back-and-forth communications with customers. I don't find this unreasonable. That's because Revolut is required to have up to date information about its account holders and information about how a customer is using an accounts, in order to comply with its legal and regulatory obligations. So, whilst I can appreciate Mr T's point of view about the necessity of the information Revolut requested, and how Revolut went about requesting what it wanted Mr T to provide, I can't reasonably say that Revolut acted unfairly or unreasonably in doing so.

So, I'm not requiring Revolut to compensate Mr T for any inconvenience that he as director of I, may have experienced as a result of the time taken by Revolut carrying out its review, and the further dissatisfaction he experienced which ultimately flowed from not having access to the funds in I's account, including his unhappiness with Revolut's communication and the information it didn't provide him.

I'll next deal with Revolut's decision to close I's account. Sometimes following a review, a bank or financial business will decide to close an account. Revolut is entitled to close an account with I just as I is entitled to close its account with Revolut. It's generally for banks and financial businesses to decide whether or not they want to provide, or to continue to provide, banking facilities to any particular customer. Unless there's a very good reason to do so, this service won't usually say that a bank must keep a customer or require it to compensate a customer who has had their account closed.

As long as they reach their decisions fairly, it doesn't breach law or regulations and is in keeping with the terms and conditions of the account, then this service won't usually intervene. But before Revolut closes an account, they must do so in way which is fair and complies with the terms and conditions of the account. I've looked at the terms and conditions, and they state that Revolut could close I's account by giving at least two months' notice. And in certain circumstances it could close the account immediately.

In this case Revolut closed Is account without notice. For Revolut to act fairly here they needed to meet the criteria to apply their terms for immediate closure – and having looked at these terms and all the evidence that Revolut has provided, I'm satisfied that Revolut did. So, it was entitled to close the account as it's already done.

I've then gone on to consider whether the bank's reasons for closing the account was fair. This can be due to several reasons, and a bank isn't obliged to give a reason to the customer. Revolut has provided some further details of its decision-making process, I'm sorry but I can't share this information with Mr T due to its commercial sensitivity. But I've seen nothing to suggest Revolut's decision around closing I's account was unfair.

In summary, I realise Mr T will be disappointed by my decision. But having looked at all the evidence and circumstances of this complaint, I can't conclude that Revolut have treated I unfairly. So, I won't be telling Revolut to do anything to resolve I's complaint.

My final decision

For the reasons I've explained, my final decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask I to accept or reject my decision before 6 February 2026.

Sharon Kerrison
Ombudsman