

The complaint

M, a limited company, complains that Revolut Ltd restricted the use of their account and withheld their funds. They'd like compensation for the disruption to their operations this caused.

What happened

The background to this complaint is well-known to both parties, so I will only cover it briefly here. In December 2024 M discovered that Revolut had restricted access to their account. When they complained, they were not given a reason for this restriction. M referred their complaint to our service, and one of our investigators didn't think Revolut had done anything wrong and didn't ask them to do anything further.

The restriction remained in place, and M didn't have access to their funds. As they were no further forward, they raised a second complaint about the length of time the review was taking, and the lack of information provided. Revolut responded to say that they could block the account while they carry out a review, and this was in line with the terms. But they offered £100 compensation for the inconvenience.

Not satisfied with this M referred their second complaint to our service. Our investigator didn't think Revolut were unreasonable in retaining the funds. He said it would be up to M to decide whether to accept the £100 but didn't ask Revolut to do anything further.

M disagreed with this. Finally in October 2025 Revolut released M's funds and closed the account. But M remained dissatisfied with what had occurred and asked for an ombudsman to consider the 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.

M originally raised a complaint about the block in December. Our investigator issued an opinion on this in February 2025, and M accepted this at the time. So, in this decision I'll only be dealing with events after February 2025.

I appreciate that it would be frustrating to M to not have access to their funds, with no clear explanation of why this was.

Like all regulated financial institutions in the UK, Revolut must meet strict legal and regulatory obligations when providing accounts to their customers. These obligations mean that sometimes they will need to take a closer look at how an account is being used, or the transactions involved in that account. And it may be necessary to restrict the use of an account, in the course of meeting these legal and regulatory obligations. There is provision for this in the terms of M's account.

There's no specific obligation on Revolut to explain to M why their account has been blocked – and Revolut haven't provided any significant detail here. But Revolut have given further information on the reasons for the restrictions to our service. The rules of our service allow me to treat certain evidence in confidence. For example, if it involves information about security procedures, or third parties.

Here I'm satisfied that it's appropriate to treat this information as confidential – so I'm sorry to M that I won't be detailing it in full, or compelling Revolut to explain the block to M. But from what I've seen, it was reasonable for them to have blocked M's account for the period that they did. I'm satisfied that this was in line with the terms; and their legal and regulatory obligations mentioned above.

I appreciate the restriction went on for a considerable period of time, but I'm not persuaded this was solely down to the actions of Revolut. I don't see that it would be appropriate for me to direct Revolut to compensate M for this. I'm pleased that M has now had the funds held returned to them. If M wishes to accept the £100 Revolut have previously offered them, then they can contact them directly. But I'm not asking them to do anything further.

My final decision

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

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask M to accept or reject my decision before 1 January 2026.

Thom Bennett
Ombudsman