

The complaint

Mr A, via a representative, complains that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) have failed to refund the money he lost as part of a fake job scam.

What happened

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties, so I will not repeat everything again here. Instead, I will focus on giving the reasons for my decision.

In summary though, Mr A was contacted via a messaging service by a scammer that I will call C. C persuaded Mr A that they worked for a company that I will call B, that would pay him for completing a series of tasks online. Periodically, while completing these tasks, he was asked to “top up” his account by paying B.

When Mr A attempted to withdraw the “income” that he could see on B’s ‘platform’, he was told that he had to pay an additional fee to clear a negative balance which would allow withdrawals commensurate with the “income” he had earned. At this point Mr A realised that he had been scammed.

Mr A sent over £14,000 in May 2025 by direct crypto withdrawals to a crypto exchange. The crypto was then sent on to B.

Mr A asked Revolut to refund the payments he made from his Revolut account, as he believes Revolut should have done more to prevent him from being scammed in the first place. Revolut did not agree with this.

One of our investigators looked into this matter and she thought that Revolut should have intervened more than it did, but given the answers provided by Mr A when it did intervene, they did not think that the scam could have been uncovered or prevented.

Mr A did not agree with this and therefore his complaint has been passed to me to issue a decision.

I note that Revolut initially explained that it did not think we could look at the crypto withdrawals. The investigator explained that, whilst we could not look at them directly, we could consider them in the wider context in relation to the deposits into the crypto wallet. As Revolut did not object to this, I will not be considering this point.

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.

In deciding what’s fair and reasonable, I am required to take into account relevant law and regulations, regulators’ rules, guidance and standards, and codes of practice; and, where appropriate, I must also take into account what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time.

Where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive or contradictory (as some of it is here), I reach my decision on the balance of probabilities – in other words, on what I consider is more likely to have (or would have) happened, in light of the available evidence and the wider circumstances.

In this decision, I'll concentrate my comments on what I think is relevant. If I don't comment on a specific point, it's not because I've failed to consider it, but because I don't think I need to comment in order to reach a fair and reasonable outcome. Our rules allow me to do this and this reflects the nature of our service as a free and informal alternative to the courts.

In broad terms, the starting position is that Revolut is expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make. This should be in accordance with the Payment Services Regulations and the terms and conditions of the customer's account.

However, taking into account relevant law, regulatory rules and guidance, relevant codes of practice and what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time, I consider it fair and reasonable that Revolut should:

- have been monitoring accounts and any payments made or received to counter various risks, including preventing fraud and scams;
- have had systems in place to look out for unusual transactions or other signs that might indicate that its customers were at risk of fraud (among other things). This is particularly so given the increase in sophisticated fraud and scams in recent years, which firms are generally more familiar with than the average customer;
- have acted to avoid causing foreseeable harm to customers, for example by maintaining adequate systems to detect and prevent scams and by ensuring all aspects of its products, including the contractual terms, enabled it to do so;
- in some circumstances, irrespective of the payment channel used, have taken additional steps, or made additional checks, or provided additional warnings, before processing a payment – (as in practice Revolut sometimes does); and
- have been mindful of – among other things – common scam scenarios, how the fraudulent practices are evolving (including for example the common use of multi-stage fraud by scammers, including the use of payments to cryptocurrency accounts as a step to defraud consumers) and the different risks these can present to consumers, when deciding whether to intervene.

In this instance, Mr A's account had not been used for several years and therefore Revolut did not have a recent account history to compare the payment to. So it didn't know what an unusual transaction would look like for Mr A. That said, I think that Revolut should have intervened during some of the crypto exchanges to find out what they related to. But I don't think that this would have stopped the scam.

I say this because I can see that Revolut did intervene a few times during the crypto withdrawals including a phone call with Mr A during the scam. Mr A, when asked questions about the scam during these interventions, provided answers that were not accurate. He never indicated that he was making these payments as part of a job opportunity. This prevented Revolut in providing a warning that related to a job scam. So I think that Mr A's choice of payment option meant that Revolut would never have been able to provide a relevant warning.

I am also mindful that Mr A did give inaccurate answers to other questions asked, such as him saying he had found the investment opportunity via friends and family - when he had been approached via a messaging service. That he was not sending funds on from his crypto account and that the company he was sending funds to was FCA registered.

Taking everything into consideration, I don't think that Revolut could have stopped the scam with a proportional intervention.

I note at one point Mr A typed the name of the scam firm as an answer to a question he was being asked (or an approximation of the name of the scam firm) and that this was a well-known clothing company. So I don't think this would've given Revolut any concern that the payments are linked to a scam. Nevertheless, I don't think that one mention of a well-known clothing company in a text box was enough for Revolut to have been aware that Mr A was falling for a job scam, especially given the rest of Mr A's answers. After all, if Mr A had explained that the transactions were part of a job opportunity that he'd come across via social media, Revolut could have provided an accurate and relevant warning.

I should also add that we have not been provided with any communication between Mr A and the scammer. I can only see one screenshot of the scam platform, which does not have Mr A's name on it. I also can't see anything that shows that the funds sent on from the crypto exchange went to the scam platform. So even if I thought that Revolut could have prevented the scam, it would be difficult for me to say what, if anything, it should refund.

I've also thought about whether Revolut could have done more to recover the funds after Mr A reported the fraud.

Revolut are under no obligation to refund the money to Mr A under any of the reimbursement schemes as crypto withdrawals are not covered. I also do not think that Revolut could have recovered the funds from the crypto exchange because they had already been sent on to B.

I appreciate this will likely come as a disappointment to Mr A, and I'm sorry to hear he has been the victim of a scam. However, I'm not persuaded that Revolut can fairly or reasonably be held liable for his apparent loss in these circumstances.

My final decision

For the reasons given above, I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr A to accept or reject my decision before 12 March 2026.

Charlie Newton
Ombudsman