

## **The complaint**

Miss M is unhappy with the length of time it took Revolut Ltd to return the money in her account after they conducted a review and then closed it.

## **What happened**

Revolut informed Miss M on 16 October 2024 that her account was to be closed in 60 days' time. The email she received asked her to withdraw her funds as soon as possible.

Miss M had money in her vault account and attempted to transfer this to her main account so she could withdraw it. However, she wasn't able to do this as the transfer was blocked.

Miss M complained to Revolut on 23 October 2024. She explained her phone had been stolen on 12 October 2024 but there was no loss as a result. She had received the closure notice and just wanted to withdraw the money she had been saving in her vault account. Revolut proceeded to ask her for the make and model of the phone that had been stolen. Miss M said this wasn't relevant to her getting her money back and so didn't provide a response to this.

Revolut issued their final response on 29 October 2024. They explained it was conducting a review of her account in order to fulfil its regulatory obligations and whilst this was underway, her account was restricted. They said they had made the decision to close Miss M's account following this review and this was in line with the terms and conditions. Revolut said they'd received a third-party request to return the funds in her account which is why the funds were on hold whilst this was reviewed. They explained this could take seven days but could be longer.

Revolut made the money available to Miss M on 30 January 2025, which Miss M then withdrew in February 2025.

Miss M referred her complaint to this service. She explained she is not complaining about the account closure as she'd had enough of the poor service from Revolut. Instead, she is unhappy with the delay in releasing her funds.

Our investigator didn't uphold the complaint. He concluded Revolut was entitled to review her account in order to comply with its legal and regulatory obligations. He said the review took longer than expected, but this was due to Miss M's refusal to provide the information Revolut had requested about her phone make and model.

Miss M disagreed with the outcome. She said it's completely false that the review took longer because she didn't provide information. She explained Revolut failed to detect that someone may have broken into her app when her phone was stolen. She said the model of her device had nothing to do with the review. Revolut asked her to remove the money in her account in the closure notice and then forbid her from doing so.

Because Miss M disagreed, the complaint has been passed to me to decide.

## Provisional decision

I issued my provisional decision on 11 September 2025. Below is what I said:

*“Miss M has explained she isn’t concerned with the closure of the account, so my provisional decision focuses on length of time it took Revolut to return the funds in Miss M’s account to her. I know this will come as a disappointment to Miss M, but I’m not minded to award her any compensation for the length of time she had to wait to receive this money.*

*Revolut has a wide range of legal and regulatory obligations they must meet when providing account services to their customers. These obligations are ongoing so don’t just apply at account opening stage. To comply with these obligations, they may need to review accounts and the activity taking place on them. Sometimes these reviews will lead to the accounts being restricted and closed. If Revolut didn’t do this, they could risk serious sanction. With this in mind, I’m satisfied Revolut was entitled to restrict Miss M’s account and carry out a review.*

*I can see Revolut asked Miss M to remove the money in her account when it sent her the closure notice on 16 October 2024. I think this was an oversight on Revolut’s part as they were still conducting their review of the account at that time. I suspect this was a generic closure notice and should have been altered to reflect Miss M wasn’t able to remove her money yet. I accept this caused confusion for Miss M.*

*Once an account is restricted, we would expect the review to be carried out without undue delay. Based on what I’ve seen, I’m satisfied Revolut reviewed the account without delay. However, what Revolut hasn’t been able to evidence is why it held onto Miss M’s money until January 2025. Revolut has admitted there was no third-party request to return the funds in Miss M’s account, despite telling her this in its final response. And from what it’s provided to this service, it would appear the review was completed by the end of October 2024. It’s not clear how Miss M’s uncooperativeness around providing the model of her phone, prevented the release of the funds. So, I’m provisionally concluding the money could have been returned to her by the end of October 2024. But it doesn’t follow that I must award Miss M compensation in these circumstances.*

*Instead, I have to consider all the circumstances and information surrounding Miss M’s complaint to decide whether I think awarding compensation would be a fair and reasonable outcome.*

*After considering what Revolut have told us and Miss M’s comments, I don’t find awarding compensation to Miss M would be fair or appropriate. I understand Miss M will naturally want to know the information I have reviewed in order to reach this finding. But I am treating this information in confidence, which is a power afforded to me under the Dispute Resolution Rules (DISP), which form part of the Financial Conduct Authority’s regulatory handbook. DISP 3.5.9R states:*

*“The ombudsman may:*

- (1) exclude evidence that would otherwise be admissible in a court or include evidence that would not be admissible in a court;*
- (2) accept information in confidence (so that only an edited version, summary or description is disclosed to the other party) where he considers it appropriate;*

*The evidence I have accepted in confidence is what Revolut has sent me to justify why it carried out the review. This has led me to decide that awarding Miss M compensation, would not be fair or appropriate for the delay in Revolut releasing the funds in her vault account or any confusion it caused by asking her to withdraw her funds in the closure letter.”*

Revolut didn't respond to the provisional decision.

Miss M didn't agree with the provisional decision. She said that she told Revolut her phone was stolen and it was only after this her account was suddenly closed. She isn't sure if someone did something with her old phone as it wasn't password protected, but she took all the action she could to protect her account but Revolut did nothing. Revolut has never told her what the suspicions on her account were.

Miss M says Revolut asked her to take her money out of the account. If they had any suspicions about her, they shouldn't have done this and should have done due diligence beforehand. If they didn't do this beforehand, how could they have known if her account was suspicious or if any abnormal behaviour was caused by her or the theft. Revolut kept asking her about the stolen phone but also kept asking her to remove the money in her account and then keeping her account blocked so that she couldn't. She can't understand their logic and behaviour.

### **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.

As explained in my provisional decision, I'm satisfied Revolut was entitled to restrict Miss M's account and conduct a review in order to comply with their legal and regulatory obligations. And I'm satisfied the review was carried out in a reasonable amount of time.

I appreciate Revolut has not explained the reason for the review to Miss M and so there is some confusion for her around why it kept asking for details of her stolen phone. But I'm satisfied Revolut doesn't have to explain its reasons to Miss M. This type of information is often commercially sensitive. Revolut does however have to share it with our service, so we can ensure it is acting correctly. It wouldn't be appropriate for me to share the reasons with Miss M, for the same reason as above. But I hope that it helps Miss M to know that someone impartial and independent has looked into her concerns.

I've concluded that Revolut held onto Miss M's money longer than necessary following the conclusion of their review. Miss M has made the point that Revolut asked her to remove the money in her account in the closure notice and in subsequent communications, but she couldn't as the account was blocked. I agree with Miss M on this point and I understand it would have been frustrating for her. But as I explained in my provisional decision, whilst Revolut did do something wrong here in keeping the money blocked for as long as it did and asking Miss M to remove it despite the block, having reviewed the evidence I have received in confidence, I don't feel awarding compensation would be fair or appropriate in the circumstances.

I know this will come as a disappointment to Miss M, but I haven't seen anything that causes me to depart from the conclusions reached in my provisional decision, so I won't be upholding her complaint.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I don't uphold Miss M's complaint against Revolut Ltd.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss M to accept or reject my decision before 27 October 2025.

Sarah Brimacombe  
**Ombudsman**