

The complaint

Miss V complains that Revolut Ltd hasn't reimbursed the money she's lost to a scam.

What happened

Miss V has fallen victim to an employment scam. In summary, she deposited money into a scam platform. She understood that her money was going towards completing tasks (helping sellers to boost their product visibility on marketplaces by simulating purchases) for a profit, and that she would be able to withdraw the money she'd deposited, along with her profit, from the platform. She realised she'd fallen victim to a scam when she was required to deposit more money in order to 'unlock' her funds.

Miss V raised a fraud claim with Revolut. She complained that the Electronic Money Institution ('EMI') had failed to adequately protect her from the scam. She's said that Revolut only intervened once, and the scammer coached her on how to respond to that intervention.

Revolut said it couldn't recover Miss V's money, and it has declined to reimburse her.

Miss V referred a complaint about Revolut to this Service which our investigator considered but didn't uphold. Miss V asked for an ombudsman's final decision, so the complaint has now been passed to me to decide.

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.

I note that Miss V made a number of cryptocurrency withdrawals to the scam platform from her Revolut account. The transfer of cryptocurrency in this way is not a regulated activity, and so I can't consider these withdrawals as part of this complaint.

The exchange of funds in an account into cryptocurrency is an ancillary activity to the regulated activity of accepting the deposit of funds into an account, so I can consider these exchanges.

According to longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements, and what I consider to be good industry practice, Revolut ought to be on the look-out for the possibility of fraud; and make additional checks before processing payments in some circumstances.

I agree with our investigator that Revolut ought to have been concerned about some of the later cryptocurrency exchanges, and it ought to have intervened proportionately. But I'm not persuaded that the EMI could've prevented any of Miss V's financial loss to this scam if it had.

I say this because I've seen that Revolut intervened in the scam activity on 1 May 2025 and Miss V told the EMI she was making payments related to a job opportunity. Revolut gave Miss V tailored written warnings in response. It told her, for example, that this is likely to be a job scam; genuine job opportunities won't require her to transfer funds as part of the job; and

it's a scam if she's told to ignore Revolut's warnings. But Miss V continued making payments. She's said that the scammer coached her through Revolut's intervention; they were coercive and manipulative; and, ultimately, she believed in the legitimacy of the employment opportunity so the EMI's warnings didn't resonate with her. On this basis, I'm not persuaded that any further or better intervention from Revolut, on the activity it identified as suspicious or any later scam activity – be it in written or human form – would've led to a different outcome. I think it's likely that Miss V would've continued reverting to the scammer on how to answer Revolut and bypassing any warnings provided.

Whilst Miss V has undoubtedly been the victim of a cruel scam, I can only uphold her complaint if I'm satisfied Revolut's failings made a material difference. For the reasons I've given, I'm not persuaded they did.

My final decision

For the reasons I've explained, my final decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss V to accept or reject my decision before 19 February 2026.

Kyley Hanson
Ombudsman