

The complaint

Miss B complains that Revolut Ltd blocked and closed her account without providing a proper explanation. She also complains that Revolut didn't adhere to the time frame it set for her to provide information when it reviewed her account.

What happened

Miss B had an account with Revolut, which she opened in 2018.

In January 2025, Revolut decided to review how Miss B was using her account to comply with its legal and regulatory obligations. On 27 January 2025, Revolut asked Miss B to provide information about her source of wealth and her connection to several businesses which had paid money into her account. Revolut told Miss B that she had until 17 February 2025 to provide the requested information otherwise it would close her account.

Miss B didn't respond and didn't provide any information. So, on 15 February 2025, Revolut sent Miss B a follow up email and told her it had decided to close her account. Revolut let Miss B know that she would be able to withdraw her account balance, and her account would be closed in April 2025. However, she wouldn't be able to use her account to receive credits.

Miss B discovered that she was unable to use her account and contacted Revolut via its in-app chat to try and find out what was happening. Miss B told Revolut that she needed access to her account and Revolut's actions were impacting her ability to receive and make payments. Miss B pointed out that Revolut had closed her account two days sooner than it said it would and said she would have provided the information. So, Revolut had treated her unfairly.

Miss B complained to Revolut. She pointed out that she'd provided information when asked to do so previously by Revolut. And maintained she would have done so on this occasion, but Revolut had closed her account before she had a chance to do so. To put things right she said Revolut should give her a proper explanation for why it no longer wanted her as a customer. And reopen her account.

In response, Revolut said it hadn't done anything wrong and had blocked and closed Miss B's account to comply with its regulatory obligations and had done so in line with the terms and conditions. Revolut apologised for any trouble and upset this had caused Miss B. So, it didn't uphold Miss B's complaint.

Miss B remained unhappy and asked us to investigate her complaint. One of our investigators reviewed Miss B's complaint and asked Revolut and Miss B for more information.

The investigator asked Revolut why it had closed Miss B's account sooner than it had said it would. Revolut said it didn't believe Miss B had any intention of complying with its request for information and after reviewing everything it decided to close Miss B's account.

The investigator asked Miss B to send them the information Revolut had requested so that it could be forwarded to Revolut. But Miss B didn't provide anything. She said Revolut had not allowed her the time it said it would provide the information which was the point of her complaint. And it hadn't returned money that had been refunded to her account.

After reviewing everything the investigator said whilst they appreciated Revolut actions had caused Miss B trouble and upset, they thought Revolut hadn't done anything wrong. They said Revolut had cut the timeframe short by two days, but they weren't convinced Miss B would have provided the information. And based on all the evidence, Revolut would still have closed Miss B's account. The investigator also arranged for Miss B's refund (0.79p, which Revolut rounded up to £1) that had been paid into her account after it had closed, to be sent to her new account.

Miss B disagreed. she said Revolut hadn't treated her fairly and she asked for an Ombudsman to review her complaint. So, 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. Some of the information Revolut has provided is information that we considered should be kept confidential. This means I haven't been able to share a lot of detail with Miss B, but I'd like to reassure her that I have considered everything.

Banks and financial business in the UK, are strictly regulated and must take certain actions in order to meet their legal and regulatory obligations. They can broadly be summarised as a responsibility to protect persons from financial harm, and to prevent and detect financial crime. That sometimes means Revolut need to review, or in some cases go as far as blocking and closing customers' accounts.

I can see that Revolut asked Miss B to provide information about the source of the funds for transactions on her account, and to explain her connection with several businesses that were paying money into her account. Revolut asked Miss B to provide information because it's obliged to adhere to the regulator – the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA), Know Your Customer (KYC) responsibilities.

Revolut is entitled to conduct such checks in order to comply with its legal and regulatory obligations. This applies to both new and existing customers regardless of how many years a customer may have held an account with Revolut. And regardless of the type of account held by a customer and if they have been subject to previous reviews – this is an ongoing obligation.

It's worth noting though that there is no set way in which the regulator requires a business to meet their KYC requirements. Each business will have their own individual procedures with respect to KYC requirements. This is to ensure each business can meet their regulatory requirements but also have the autonomy to operate its business as it sees fit. So, whilst I've considered Miss B's general comments about Revolut's approach to discharging its regulatory duties, I haven't seen anything to persuade me its processes had a detrimental impact on Miss B.

I want to make it clear that I understand why what happened concerned Miss B. I've no doubt it would've come as quite a shock to her, and she would've been very worried to find out that her bank card had stopped working. But, I've considered the basis for Revolut's review and having done so I find this was legitimate and in line with its legal and regulatory obligations. So, I'm satisfied Revolut acted fairly by reviewing Miss B's account. I appreciate that Miss B wants to know more about why Revolut did what it did. And she disputes that she has done anything that would warrant Revolut's actions. But Revolut isn't obliged to tell Miss B why it blocked and reviewed her account, and I don't believe it would be appropriate for me to require it to do so as much as she'd like to know.

The terms and conditions of Miss B's account also make provision for Revolut to review and suspend an account. And having looked at all the evidence, including the information Revolut has shared with us in confidence, I'm satisfied that Revolut have acted in line with these when it reviewed and suspended Miss B's account. So, although I understand not having access to her account caused Miss B trouble and upset it wouldn't be appropriate for me to award Miss B compensation since I don't believe Revolut acted inappropriately in taking the actions that it did when it reviewed Miss B's account and asked her to provide information.

The result of the review was that Revolut decided they didn't want to provide banking services to Miss B anymore. Revolut wrote to Miss B on 15 February 2025 to let her know that it had decided to close her account.

It's generally for banks and financial businesses to decide whether or not they want to provide, or to continue to provide, account facilities to any particular customer. Unless there's a very good reason to do so, this service won't usually say that a bank or financial business must keep customer or require it to compensate a customer who has had their account closed.

As long as banks and financial businesses 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. They shouldn't decline to continue to provide account services without proper reason, for instance of unfair bias or unlawful discrimination. And they must treat new and existing customers fairly.

Revolut have relied on the terms and conditions when closing Miss B's account. I've reviewed the terms, and they explain that in certain circumstances, Revolut can also close an account without notice, which I consider is what happened here, since Revolut blocked Miss B's account.

For Revolut to act fairly here they needed to meet the criteria to apply their terms for immediate closure. Revolut has provided some further details of its decision-making process, which led to the closure of Miss B's account. I'm sorry but I can't share this information with Miss B due to its commercial sensitivity. But I've seen nothing to suggest Revolut's decision around closing Miss B's account was unfair. As I've said above Revolut are obliged under regulation to carry out ongoing KYC checks to protect accounts from identify theft, fraud, and financial crime. So, if they don't receive the necessary information that they request to allay those risks, I do not consider suspending and sending Miss B a notice that it would close her account is a disproportionate measure for Revolut to take. On balance when considering Revolut's wider regulatory responsibilities and all the information available to me, I find Revolut had a legitimate basis for closing Miss B's account immediately. So, I can't say its treated Miss B unfairly.

The crux of Miss B's complaint is that she says Revolut didn't adhere to the timeframe it gave her to provide information. Miss B says Revolut went ahead and closed her account

when she still had two days to provide the information it had requested. She has said she was always willing to provide the information and complied with previous requests Revolut had made.

I can see that Revolut told Miss B she had until 17 February 2025 to provide them with the information it had requested and if she didn't do so it would close her account. Miss B didn't provide Revolut with any information despite being sent a chaser to do so on 15 February 2025. And Revolut made the decision to close Miss B's account on 15 February 2025. So, I'm satisfied that Revolut closed Miss B's account sooner than it initially told Miss B – two days earlier. But it doesn't follow that I must award Miss B compensation in these circumstances. Instead, I have to consider all the circumstances and information surrounding Miss B's complaint to decide whether I think awarding compensation would be a fair and reasonable outcome.

After considering what Miss B has said and the content of Revolut's review, which includes the information Revolut has provided to our service in confidence, I don't find awarding Miss B compensation would be fair or appropriate. I understand Miss B would naturally want to know the information I have weighted in order to reach this finding. But as I've set out already, I am treating this information in confidence, which is a power afforded to me under the Dispute Resolution Rules (DISP), which form part of the Financial Conduct Authority's regulatory handbook.

Accordingly, I have accepted information in confidence which I am not disclosing to Miss B. And the description of that information is that it's of a nature which justifies Revolut review, and which has led me to decide that awarding Miss B compensation would not be a fair or appropriate outcome for any of the matters she has brought as part of this complaint.

So, I'm not requiring Revolut to compensate Miss B for any trouble she may have experienced because Revolut decided to close her account two days earlier than it initially told her it would. In reaching this conclusion I've also kept in mind that although Miss B maintains she would have provided the information, when asked to do so by our investigator, she hasn't provided anything. So, I'm not persuaded by Miss B's comments that she would have provided the necessary information.

In summary, I recognise how strongly Miss B feels about her complaint, so I realise she will be disappointed by my decision. But overall, based on the evidence I've seen I won't be telling Revolut to do anything more to resolve Miss B'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 Miss B to accept or reject my decision before 3 March 2026.

Sharon Kerrison
Ombudsman