

The complaint

Miss B has complained Monzo Bank Ltd won't refund her for transactions that she didn't authorise.

What happened

In July 2025 Miss B complained to Monzo that there were two transactions made from her account that she'd not authorised. These had been made through another provider's payment app.

Miss B explained to Monzo she felt these transactions had been made whilst her phone was out of her possession when she was at an event in the park. She was able to find her phone later that evening thrown into a bush.

Monzo wouldn't refund Miss B as they believed the transactions had been authorised using Miss B's existing mobile device. They were also not convinced by Miss B's testimony that she'd received a scam call and ended up transferring money from another account she held (with a bank I'll call S) to her Monzo account.

Miss B brought her complaint to the ombudsman service.

Our investigator considered the evidence. She felt this was sufficient to show Miss B had authorised the transactions.

Following this view, Miss B continued to provide her testimony about what had happened on 1 July 2025. She was unconvinced by the audit information confirming the timing of the transactions. She also believed Monzo hadn't complied with their obligations under the Payment Services Regulations 2017.

Our investigator continued to update Miss B about what was going on and what she'd discovered from S about a fraud claim Miss B had made. She noted Miss B's concerns about her financial position but wasn't able to oblige Monzo to take any further action.

Unhappy with this outcome, Miss B has asked an ombudsman to consider her complaint.

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 reached the same outcome as our investigator. I'll explain why.

Where there is a dispute about what happened, I have based my decision on the balance of probabilities. In other words, on what I consider is most likely to have happened in the light of the evidence.

It's worth stating that I can choose which weight to place on the different types of evidence I review, including technical evidence, provided by financial institutions along with

complainants' persuasive testimony.

When considering what is fair and reasonable, I'm required to take into account: relevant law and regulations; regulators' rules, guidance and standards; codes of practice; and, where appropriate, what I consider to have been good industry practice at the relevant time.

I can see that Miss B has put a lot of work into compiling her response to our service. I note the research she's done into relevant laws and codes of practice. Our investigator responded in detail and I've not included any reference to this within my decision as it has no bearing on my findings. However, as Miss B will note, I am satisfied that Monzo have met their obligations as I confirm below.

The regulations which are relevant to Miss B's complaint are the Payment Services Regulations 2017 (PSRs). These primarily require banks and financial institutions to refund customers if they didn't make or authorise payments themselves.

I am satisfied the two disputed transactions were authorised by Miss B. I say this because:

- Miss B says she received a call from someone purporting to be from S telling her a transaction hadn't happened. She then felt the need to protect money in her S account by transferring it to Monzo. The evidence shows two payments from Miss B from her account with S which enabled the two disputed transactions to be made. These were for £100 and £400 and took place at 18:02 and 18:47. Miss B accepts she made these. Having looked at evidence from both S and Monzo, I believe the timings of these transactions are not in dispute.
- The two disputed payments are for £100 and £380 to a payment service I'll call K. These took place at 18:04 and 18:48, immediately after the two credits to Miss B's Monzo account. These are made using open banking which means they were initiated through K's app but required authentication using the Monzo app. I believe the evidence Monzo has provided confirms that only Miss B could have made these. I'm satisfied this meets the two parts of authorisation – authentication and consent – as required by the PSRs.
- Miss B has said she didn't have her mobile as this was whilst it had been stolen. But she does admit making the payments from S to Monzo. Having reviewed the timing and the evidence about the device used, I don't find Miss B's testimony around this credible.
- Miss B has said she doesn't have an account with K but admits she used this service two weeks prior to the disputed transactions to buy a pram which was never delivered. I note that these three payments made on 13 and 14 June were also made using open banking through the K app. Again, I'm not convinced by Miss B's testimony.
- There's a transaction made at 18:21 in a local supermarket on 1 July. Miss B has said as this was by an Apple Pay token, she used her Apple watch. This doesn't match the evidence Monzo has shared.

I am sure that something has been going on here and our investigator did what she could to get to the bottom of this.

Miss B has alleged she was the victim of a theft and a scam but hasn't been able to provide the evidence to back this up. I note the screenshots she's shared about dodgy messages. These seem to me to be examples of the type of scam messages that many of us receive on

a daily basis. But I can see nothing to indicate any scam here.

I can see she received a phone call which she claims provoked the payments she made from S to Monzo. But that doesn't explain why these two payments are made 45 minutes apart, and whilst funds remained in Miss B's account with S.

That said, I do think Miss B isn't telling us the whole truth and whether that's because she made payments she now regrets – perhaps crypto investments – I can't say.

I won't be asking Monzo to refund Miss B as there are no grounds for me to ask them to do this. I believe Miss B authorised these transactions.

I note Monzo offered compensation to Miss B for not dealing with her complaint as promptly as they felt they should have. Like our investigator, I feel this amount is generous and I won't be asking Monzo to pay her anymore.

My final decision

For the reasons given, my final decision is not to uphold Miss B's complaint against Monzo Bank Ltd.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss B to accept or reject my decision before 10 October 2025.

Sandra Quinn
Ombudsman