

The complaint

Mr K, via a representative, has complained that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) failed to refund the money he lost as part of a 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 K was the victim of an investment scam. I will call the scam website “B”. My understanding that this particular scam, based on what I have seen from an archived version of its website, offered plans that could be purchased using various crypto currencies. Daily guaranteed rewards were promised ranging from 2.5% to over 3%.

Mr K made around 9 payments to the scammers from his Revolut account. These were made by direct crypto transfers. The transactions took place between in March and April 2025 and totalled over £10,000. I note that Mr K’s representative has highlighted more payments than this, but these were exchanges to and from crypto currency and do not seem to be actual withdrawals from the account.

Mr K realised he had been scammed when he was unable to withdraw his profits. Mr K 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.

Around this time, Mr K contacted a scam recovery firm and sent it a payment to try and recover his funds. Unfortunately this also turned out to be a scam.

One of our investigators looked into this matter and she thought that Revolut should have intervened more than it did, but she did not think that an appropriate and proportionate intervention would have stopped the scam. She therefore did not uphold this complaint.

Mr K did not agree with this and therefore this case has been passed to me to issue a final decision.

I note that Revolut said that we can’t look at the direct crypto transfers. I see that the investigator explained why we could look at the actions surrounding these transfers. Revolut did not disagree, so I will not be commenting on this.

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, I think that Revolut should have intervened more than it did and I think an appropriate intervention would have been a tailored written warning. But I don't think that this would have stopped the scam. I say this because Revolut did intervene on a number of occasions and there were a series of online warnings provided to Mr K. Mr K did not heed any of the warnings provided, even when these warnings included some of features of the scams that Mr K was actually falling for. These included warnings that Mr K was being likely being scammed; that high returns for a low risk was likely a scam; that guaranteed high returns are a sign of fraud (I consider *guaranteed* daily 2% plus returns as unrealistic); and that a lack of clear explanation on how returns are generated is a sign of a scam.

I think that Revolut should have asked slightly more questions and provided a more tailored warning. But I don't think that this would have stopped the scam, as he was already provided with several warnings. He also gave answers that limited Revolut's ability to make the warning even more relevant - such as saying that the scam firm were FCA registered and he had not been offered high returns.

So given the above and given that Revolut was only required to take proportionate steps to try and protect Mr K from financial harm, I'm not persuaded that an appropriate and proportionate intervention would have stopped the initial scam.

I have also considered whether Revolut should have stopped the payment made to the recovery scam as it was on notice that Mr K had been scammed at this point. But I can see that again, Revolut did ask about this payment and Mr K said he was just sending funds to one of his own accounts and that it was not related to an investment. Given this, I don't think it needed to intervene more. I also can see that Mr K said to the recovery scammer in the chat between them, that he had been warned by Revolut that the payment was likely a scam and he sent the money anyway. So I don't think that Revolut could have stopped the recovery scam either.

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

Revolut are under no obligation to refund the money under any of the reimbursement schemes, as the funds were sent to accounts in Mr K's own name and were crypto transfers. So, I don't think that the funds could have been recovered by other means.

I appreciate this will likely come as a great disappointment to Mr K, and I'm sorry to hear he has been the victim of scams. However, whilst I have a great deal of sympathy for the situation that Mr K 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 K to accept or reject my decision before 24 February 2026.

Charlie Newton
Ombudsman