

The complaint

Miss S complains Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) hasn’t refunded funds she lost as the result of a scam.

What happened

Both parties are familiar with the circumstances of the complaint, so I’ll only summarise the key details here.

Miss S complains that she sent two payments from her account with Revolut to what she thought was a legitimate task-based job. When Miss S didn’t get her money back, she realised she had been scammed, so she contacted Revolut.

Revolut investigated her complaint but didn’t uphold it. Miss S said she didn’t receive a response to her complaint from Revolut and so she raised the matter with the Financial Ombudsman Service. One of our Investigators looked into the complaint and didn’t uphold it.

As an agreement could not be reached, the complaint 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’m sorry that Miss S has been the victim of a scam. I realise she’s lost a meaningful sum of money and I don’t underestimate the impact this has had on her. And so, I’d like to reassure her that I’ve read and considered everything she’s said in support of her complaint. But I’ll focus my comments on what I think is relevant. If I don’t mention any specific point, it’s not because I’ve failed to take it on board and think about it, but because I don’t think I need to comment on it to reach what I think is a fair and reasonable outcome. I know this will come as a disappointment to Miss S but having done so, I won’t be upholding her complaint. I’ll explain why.

In broad terms, the starting position at law is that banks and other payment service providers are expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make, in accordance with the Payment Services Regulations and the terms and conditions of the customer’s account.

Miss S authorised the payments in question here – so even though she was tricked into doing so and didn’t intend for her money to end up in the hands of a scammer, she is presumed liable in the first instance.

But as a matter of good industry practice, Revolut should also have taken proactive steps to identify and help prevent transactions – particularly unusual or uncharacteristic transactions – that could involve fraud or be the result of a scam. However, there is a balance to be struck: as while banks and Electronic Money Institutions should be alert to fraud and scams

to act in their customers' best interests, they can't reasonably be involved in every transaction.

I've thought about whether Revolut acted fairly and reasonably in its dealings with Miss S when she made the payments, or whether it should have done more than it did. In doing so I've considered what Revolut knew about the payments at the time it received Miss S's payment instructions and what action, if any, Revolut took prior to processing the payments.

I don't think the payments were of an unusually excessive value or that a fraud trend had emerged that ought to have caused Revolut to be concerned that Miss S was potentially falling victim to a scam. Although the payments were made on the same day they were made hours apart and had a low value when combined. While they were for cryptocurrency, which carries a heightened risk of fraud, this isn't enough to suggest to Revolut that Miss S was potentially falling victim to a scam. So, I don't think the payments were suspicious in nature to suggest to Revolut that Miss S was at a heightened risk of financial harm from fraud. I therefore don't think it was unreasonable for Revolut to process the payments in-line with her payment instructions.

Although I don't think the payments suggested Miss S was at risk of financial harm from fraud such that Revolut ought to have intervened, Revolut told us it did, so I'll comment on that intervention.

Revolut declined a payment Miss S made and informed her the payment was blocked as it was identified as a possible scam and it had blocked similar merchants. This gave Miss S the option to 'Keep merchants blocked' or to 'Continue to questions'. Miss S selected to 'Continue to questions'.

In summary Revolut highlighted the importance of answering truthfully and if she was being told what to say it may be a scam. Revolut asked Miss S the purpose of the payment and she indicated she was transferring funds to another of her accounts for an investment which she'd heard about from friends or family. 'It's related to a job opportunity' was an option Miss S could have selected and the one that best fit the circumstances of the payment. Miss S was asked further questions and shown warnings relating to the payment purpose she gave. These didn't resonate with her, likely because they weren't relevant to the scam she was falling victim to, a job scam. The merchant was unblocked and further payments were then made by Miss S which she lost to the scam.

A firm's intervention relies on a customer giving accurate answers, where that doesn't happen, as is the case here, it can impact the actions a firm takes. Revolut's response to the risk the payment presented was proportionate, and I wouldn't have expected it to intervene further. As I don't find Revolut could reasonably have prevented Miss S's loss, it wouldn't be fair or reasonable to hold it liable.

I've thought about whether there's anything else Revolut could have done to help Miss S — including if it took the steps it should have once it was aware that the payments were the result of fraud.

After the debit card payments were made, the only potential avenue for recovery of the payment would have been through the chargeback scheme. The chargeback scheme is a voluntary scheme set up to resolve card payment disputes between merchants and cardholders. Revolut is bound by the card scheme provider's chargeback rules. Whilst there is no 'right' to a chargeback, I consider it to be good practice that a chargeback be raised if there is a reasonable chance of it succeeding. But a chargeback can only be made within the scheme rules, meaning there are only limited grounds and limited forms of evidence that

will be accepted for a chargeback to be considered valid, and potentially succeed. Time limits also apply. Unfortunately, the chargeback rules don't cover scams.

I'm sorry to disappoint Miss S further, but I've thought carefully about everything that has happened, and with all the circumstances of this complaint in mind I don't think Revolut needs to refund Miss S's money. And while I appreciate not receiving Revolut's response to her complaint would have been frustrating to Miss S, I can't see this impacted the outcome of her claim or complaint and so I don't think that compensation is warranted. I realise this means Miss S is out of pocket and I'm really sorry she's lost this money. However, for the reasons I've explained, I don't think I can reasonably uphold this complaint.

My final decision

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

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss S to accept or reject my decision before 23 February 2026.

Charlotte Mulvihill
Ombudsman