

## **The complaint**

Mr G, initially via a representative, has complained that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) failed to refund the money he lost as part of an investment 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 G was contacted by someone pretending to be a recruiter for a company that I will call B. They said that Mr G could earn money completing online tasks, but he would occasionally have to pay money upfront to unlock these tasks and receive his earnings. To do this he would have to send crypto to B.

Mr G then made around 6 payments to B. These were made by card payments to crypto exchanges. The payments made from Mr G’s Revolut account totalled over £4,000 and took place in January 2025.

Mr G realised he had been scammed when he was unable to withdraw his earnings without paying additional fees. Mr G asked Revolut to refund these payments, 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 any intervention from Revolut would not have stopped the scam. She said this because she believed that Mr G was being coached by the scammer on what to say if questioned about the payments that he was making. She therefore did not uphold this complaint.

Mr G did not agree with this and I note that Mr G was contacted in the last few months by the investigator who asked some follow up questions as to why Mr G did not agree with her assessment. There has been no response from Mr G and the deadline for a response has been exceeded, therefore the case has been passed to me to issue a final 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 agree with the conclusions reached by the investigator for the following reasons.

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 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.

Revolut did intervene and asked questions about the transactions that Mr G was making. From what I can see about these interventions, it is clear that the answers that Mr G provided stopped Revolut from providing a relevant warning and stopping the scam.

I can see that Revolut blocked two payments completely and Mr G, when asked about the payments, mentioned that he was investing and Revolut then asked a number of questions about what Mr G was doing. Mr G answered that he was not being guided on what to say, that he was investing on advice of an investment manager. Revolut then provided a number of warnings about crypto investments during this process and Mr G abandoned making these payments - selecting the option that the process was too complicated. I can see that Mr G did name the scam platform during this intervention. So I considered whether this should have concerned Revolut. But there were no official warnings at the time of the payments about B and any in any event, the payments were cancelled so in effect, the intervention did what it was required to do.

Revolut then intervened again later in the scam on the day where all six successful payments were made, I can see that it intervened during the last payment of the six. I think it should have intervened earlier than it did, but I don't think that this would have stopped the scam. The scammer seems to have been aware, if Mr G gave accurate answers as to what he was doing, his payments might be stopped and it seems that Mr G was being coached on what to say. This is demonstrated by the scammer telling Mr G what to say about the transactions and Mr G has confirmed that the scammer told him what to say to get around Revolut's security questions. It is also clear that Mr G was under the spell of the scammer, as it appears he did give misleading answers to Revolut.

During this intervention, Revolut did specifically say that if someone was telling Mr G what to say, then this may be a scam, yet this did not dissuade Mr G from pressing ahead with the transactions.

Then when asked, Mr G said this transaction was to send money to his own account – even though he was presented with the option of selecting that he was sending the funds as part of a job opportunity. Further questions were asked and Mr G said that he was sending funds specifically to a bank account he held with a different provider - rather than to an investment account. The warning even said that a crypto wallet is an example of an investment account. Because of how Mr G answered the questions, this resulted in Revolut providing a warning about the risks of a safe account scam rather than a job scam.

It could be argued that, as the funds were clearly going to a crypto exchange, then Revolut should have provided a generic crypto warning at this point. But given that Revolut had already done this during the cancelled two payments, I don't think that this would have stopped the scam.

With this in mind and given that Revolut was only required to take proportionate steps to try and protect Mr G from financial harm. I'm not persuaded he would've shared anything concerning with Revolut, had it questioned him more about what he was doing. So overall, I think that Revolut should have intervened earlier than it did. But I do not think that this would have likely stopped or uncovered the scam or allowed Revolut to provide a relevant warning that would have resonated with him.

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

Revolut are under no obligation to refund the money, as the Authorised Push Payment Reimbursement Scheme does not cover card payments or transfers to an account in the customer's own name.

I also don't think that the funds could have been recovered by a chargeback, as the money was used essentially to purchase crypto, and Mr G did (at least initially) receive the crypto he'd purchased. It was only when he transferred the crypto to the scammers did the loss occur.

I also note that Revolut did attempt a chargeback, but it was not successful. I don't think it needed to do anything more than this. So, I don't think that Revolut could have recovered the funds via other means.

I appreciate this will likely come as a disappointment to Mr G, and I'm sorry to hear he has been the victim of a scam. However, whilst I have a great deal of sympathy for the situation that Mr G found himself in, I'm not persuaded that Revolut can fairly or reasonably be held liable for his 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 G to accept or reject my decision before 21 November 2025.

Charlie Newton  
**Ombudsman**