

The complaint

Miss K complains that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) hasn’t protected her from losing money to a scam.

What happened

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties, so I won’t repeat everything here. In brief summary, Miss K has explained that in May 2025 she made a number of transactions from her Revolut account for what she thought was a legitimate opportunity. Miss K subsequently realised she’d been scammed and got in touch with Revolut. Ultimately, Revolut didn’t reimburse Miss K’s lost funds, and Miss K referred her complaint about Revolut to us. As our Investigator couldn’t resolve the matter informally, the case has been passed to me for a decision.

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 decided to not uphold Miss K’s complaint for materially the same reasons as our Investigator.

I’m very aware that I’ve summarised this complaint briefly, in less detail than has been provided, and in my own words. No discourtesy is intended by this. Instead, I’ve focused on what I think is the heart of the matter. If there’s something I’ve not mentioned, it isn’t because I’ve ignored it – I haven’t. I’m satisfied I don’t need to comment on every individual point or argument to be able to reach what I think is the right outcome. Our rules allow me to do this, reflecting the informal nature of our service as a free alternative to the courts.

I don’t doubt Miss K has been the victim of a cruel scam here. She has my heartfelt sympathy. Ultimately, however, Miss K has suffered her loss because of fraudsters, and this doesn’t automatically entitle her to a refund from Revolut. It would only be fair for me to tell Revolut to reimburse Miss K her loss (or part of it) if I thought Revolut reasonably ought to have prevented the transactions (or some of them) in the first place, or Revolut unreasonably hindered recovery of the funds after the transactions had been made; and if I was satisfied, overall, this was a fair and reasonable outcome.

I’m satisfied Miss K authorised the relevant transactions. Revolut would generally be expected to process transactions a customer authorises it to make. And under The Payment Services Regulations and the terms and conditions of the account, Miss K is presumed liable for the loss in the first instance, in circumstances where she authorised the transactions. That said, as a matter of good industry practice Revolut should have taken proactive steps to identify and help prevent transactions – particularly sufficiently unusual or uncharacteristic transactions – that could involve fraud or be the result of a scam. However, there are many transactions made by customers each day and it’s not realistic or reasonable to expect Revolut to stop and check every payment instruction. There’s a balance to be struck

between identifying transactions that could potentially be fraudulent, and minimising disruption to legitimate payments (allowing customers ready access to their funds).

However, in this case I can see that Revolut did intervene in some of the transactions but this didn't make a difference – Miss K still proceeded with things. I can also see that Miss K instructed some payments from an account she held with another bank as a result of this same scam and that when that bank intervened and spoke to Miss K about the payments she wasn't upfront with them about the real context behind her payments. Now, I agree with our Investigator that I'd expect Revolut to have intervened further than it did when Miss K instructed three card payments to a cryptocurrency provider on the same day which collectively totalled not an insignificant amount in terms of proportionate fraud and scams monitoring. But bearing in mind the balance I've mentioned above that needs to be struck, I wouldn't expect Revolut to have interrogated Miss K, but instead to ask her some questions about the purpose of these transactions and to present her with fraud and scams warnings appropriate to the specific risk identified. However, I'm not persuaded from the evidence I've seen that it's likely Miss K would have been upfront with Revolut about the real reasons for her payments. From what I've seen, which includes Miss K's messages with the scammer(s), it appears to me that she was under the spell of the scam and the scammer(s) to the extent that I think she would unfortunately have been intent on saying whatever she needed to get the transactions put through irrespective of any warnings she might have been given about her potentially being scammed. Unfortunately for Miss K this means that I can't say it would be fair for me to hold Revolut responsible for Miss K having made these transactions and lost them.

I've thought about whether Revolut unreasonably missed an opportunity to recover the transactions when Miss K reported the scam. However, these payments were ultimately converted into cryptocurrency and lost to the scammers that way. There isn't any way Revolut would reasonably have been able to recover the payments in these circumstances.

I'm really sorry Miss K was scammed and lost this money. However, despite my natural sympathy, I can't fairly tell Revolut to reimburse her in circumstances where I'm not persuaded it reasonably ought to have prevented the transactions or to have recovered them.

My final decision

For the reasons explained, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss K to accept or reject my decision before 5 March 2026.

Neil Bridge
Ombudsman