

The complaint

Mr N complains that Revolut Ltd ('Revolut') won't refund the money he lost to a job scam.

What happened

The background is known to both parties, so I won't repeat all the details. In summary, in April 2025, Mr N was contacted on his messaging *app* by someone (a scammer) offering a remote job opportunity. He'd been applying for work and had uploaded his CV to sites.

For the job itself, he was led to believe he would receive commission for completing sets of online 'tasks'. As part of the process, he was asked to deposit his own funds, in cryptocurrency, to complete the 'work'. He was later advised to open an account with a genuine crypto-platform ('C') to facilitate payments. To make the scam more convincing, he was given access to a 'workbench' platform and allowed to make withdrawals initially.

Mr N realised he'd been scammed when he tried to withdraw his money but was repeatedly told he needed to pay more for that to happen. By that time, over £27,000 had been sent from Revolut between 10 and 14 April 2025 in a series of transactions. Some of the funds were sent as crypto-withdrawals on Revolut's platform. The highest amount was instead sent from Revolut to Mr N's account with C, and then transferred onwards from there.

The scam was reported to Revolut in April 2025. A complaint was raised and referred to our Service. Our Investigator considered it and didn't uphold it. In short, he noted some of the activity on the Revolut account was outside our Service's jurisdiction. And although some of the transactions ought to have flagged as concerning, he wasn't persuaded that the scam would have been prevented given the responses Revolut received when it did intervene.

As the matter could not be resolved informally, it 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.

Having done so, I've decided not to uphold it for similar reasons as the Investigator.

The operation of cryptocurrency services isn't generally regulated by the UK's financial regulator. And a complaint relating to the cryptocurrency withdrawals isn't something we have the power to consider. But Mr N deposited fiat into his Revolut account. He also exchanged fiat into cryptocurrency (which was withdrawn through its platform). I think it's arguable that our Service can look at these earlier steps in relation to this complaint – whether Revolut should have intervened on the fiat deposits or on the exchanges of fiat into cryptocurrency – as well as Mr N's later payment to his account with C.

Authorisation and Prevention

In line with the Payment Services Regulations 2017, a firm is expected to execute authorised payment instructions without undue delay. Here, it's not in dispute that Mr N authorised the

transactions in question, so the starting position is that he's responsible for them in the first instance. That's usually the position even where the money has been lost to a scam.

But, as Revolut will know, there are some situations where, taking into account relevant rules, codes and best practice, it should reasonably have taken a closer look at the circumstances of a transaction – if, for example, it's particularly suspicious.

In this case, I don't think it was remiss of Revolut not to have questioned the deposits, given the amounts and that they originated from Mr N's genuine account. There was probably enough about the account activity for it to have intervened when Mr N's exchanges of fiat into cryptocurrency reached significant amounts on 14 April 2025 (but not before). I think it should also have intervened on Mr N's payment to C that day, considering its value and the elevated risks associated with the type of payee. But, as referred to by the Investigator, Revolut did intervene on some transactions. And, on the evidence, I'm not persuaded it could have reasonably prevented the scam based on the responses it received.

For example, when Revolut intervened on some of the crypto-withdrawals, Mr N was asked a series of automated questions in the payment flow. He indicated that he was buying cryptocurrency for investment and that he had checked reviews and found no mention of scams. At times, he selected that he had found the opportunity through friends or family. He was provided with written warnings about common features of crypto-investment scams, including offers on social media, promises of high returns, and the use of remote access.

A live intervention took place for Mr N's largest payment to C. In that call, he was asked to answer truthfully. From the outset, Mr N said he would be proceeding with the transaction and that he was happy the funds would be received in his wallet. When asked why he was using Revolut, he explained that his personal bank ('W') would not allow him to trade, and that he was moving funds to C because Revolut had repeatedly blocked his transactions. He said he had been investing in cryptocurrency for over a year, and had only just started using C as he was unhappy with the fees charged by his previous crypto-platform.

On the basis that Mr N was 'investing', Revolut warned him about scammers instructing customers to send funds through legitimate accounts to third-party wallets. He was warned about fake platforms, false profits and fake withdrawals used to gain trust. He was also warned about fees/taxes and of victims trapped in a cycle of sending more money. He was told to stop transactions immediately if he noticed any of these signs or if someone was guiding his communication. When asked how he planned to invest, Mr N said he would be holding the funds with C to invest as and when, and referred to some digital coins.

Towards the end of the call, Mr N confirmed that no one had contacted him about investment opportunities or asked him to be untruthful. Importantly, he said he wouldn't be sending the funds on from C to a third party, and that the funds would remain with C until he chose to withdraw them to his account with W. He was then asked to take a moment to reconsider and reminded that if he had any doubts or needed assistance, he could ask for help.

I'm satisfied that Revolut took proportionate steps to establish whether a possible scam was taking place and I don't think it was a failing on its part to process the transactions based on the answers it was given. And I'm not persuaded by Mr N's comments that the poor call signal was a significant factor or that the answers Revolut was given were the result of a lack of understanding of the questions he was asked. He has told us he was being coached by the scammer on what to say and that his responses were influenced by them in real time – and I can't overlook that at no time was Revolut given any indication that the payments were in connection with a job Mr N had been offered on the back of a message he'd received.

I'll add that, even if I were to find that Revolut could have probed more or intervened at

different points, I don't think that things would have played out very differently. In my view, Mr N was significantly under the scammer's spell and intent on making the payments to the extent that he moved past some relevant warnings and provided responses that were inconsistent with the truth. While I understand he acted under influence believing he could then access his money, I think it's likely Mr N would have still been guided to find a way around the truth or another way to make the payments if necessary. And, as a matter of causation, I can't hold Revolut liable for Mr N's losses in circumstances where I think it's unlikely that proportionate steps would have made a difference to what happened.

I've also considered the information Mr N has provided about his medical conditions, which he says contributed to the success of the scam (and I thank him for sharing it). However, I don't find that this was something Revolut should reasonably have picked up on during its interactions or that it was a failure to put in place different arrangements that prevented the scam from being exposed.

This isn't a decision I've made lightly. I'm very sorry Mr N was the victim of a scam that's affected him deeply. But I'm not persuaded that Revolut missed an opportunity to prevent the scam or that further proportionate steps would have prevented Mr N's losses in any event. As for recovery, I agree there was little Revolut could have done to recover the crypto-withdrawals. For the payment to C, this was to Mr N's own account. If any funds remained to be recovered Mr N would have been able to access them himself.

My final decision

For the reasons I've given, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr N to accept or reject my decision before 13 February 2026.

Thomas Cardia
Ombudsman