

## **The complaint**

Mr G, via a representative, complains that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) have 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 G came across what looked to be an investment firm but was actually a scammer that I will call B.

Mr G sent over £20,000 in February 2025 by direct crypto withdrawal to a crypto exchange. The crypto was then sent on to B.

Mr G asked Revolut to refund the payments he made from his Revolut account, 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 he thought that given the answers provided by Mr G when it did intervene, they did not think that the scam could have been uncovered or prevented.

Mr G did not agree with this and therefore his complaint has been passed to me to issue a decision.

I note that Revolut initially explained that it did not think we could look at the crypto withdrawals. The investigator explained that, whilst we could not look at them directly, we could consider them in the wider context in relation to the deposits into the crypto wallet. As Revolut did not object to this, I will not be addressing this point.

## **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, Mr G's accounts had not been used to exchange large amounts of fiat currency into crypto before. So, I think that Revolut should have intervened during some of the crypto exchanges to find out what they related to. But I don't think that this would have stopped the scam.

I say this because I can see that Revolut did intervene during the final crypto withdrawal. Mr G, when asked questions about the scam during these interventions, provided answers that were not accurate. He never indicated that he was making these payments as part of an investment opportunity. This prevented Revolut in providing a warning that related to an investment scam. So I think that Mr G's choice of payment option meant that Revolut would never have been able to provide a relevant warning.

I am also mindful that Mr G was in contact with the scammer and agreed to discuss what answers that he would give Revolut as the scammer said if he gave the wrong answers to Revolut then his payments would be blocked. This suggests that if Revolut asked more questions about the payments, then he would have given answers suggested by the scammer to ensure he could circumvent any interventions from Revolut.

So taking everything into consideration, I don't think that Revolut could have stopped the scam with a proportional intervention.

I also can't see anything that shows that the crypto was actually sent to the scammer. Initially it was indicated that the funds were sent via a crypto exchange and two different exchanges were mentioned. Now it seems to be the case that the crypto was sent directly to the scammers wallet. But there is nothing to link the crypto withdrawals to the scammers - such as a wallet address in the scam chat. So even if I thought that Revolut could have prevented the scam, it would be difficult for me to say what, if anything, it should refund.

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 to Mr G under any of the reimbursement schemes as crypto withdrawals are not covered. I also do not think that Revolut could have recovered the funds from the crypto exchange because they had already been sent on to B.

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, I'm not persuaded that Revolut can fairly or reasonably be held liable for his apparent 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 20 March 2026.

Charlie Newton  
**Ombudsman**