

The complaint

Mr W is unhappy that Revolut Ltd won't reimburse money he lost to a scam.

Mr W is professionally represented in bringing his complaint, but for ease of reading, I'll refer to all submissions as being made by Mr W directly throughout this decision.

What happened

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties, so I won't repeat everything here. In summary, Mr W has explained that between January and February 2025 he made payments from his Revolut account towards a cryptocurrency investment which he ultimately lost to a scam.

Mr W advises he was contacted by someone over the phone, who I will refer to as "the scammer". The scammer advised he could help Mr W recover funds he had previously lost to an investment. Mr W sent funds from his Revolut account to a legitimate cryptocurrency provider and then on to the scammers.

Mr W realised he had fallen victim to a scam when the scammer stopped communicating with him and he wasn't able to withdraw his funds. Mr W has said he lost a total of £15,000 from his Revolut account as a result of the scam.

Mr W raised a complaint with Revolut. It didn't think it had done anything wrong by allowing the payments to go through. Mr W remained unhappy, so he brought his complaint to our service.

Our Investigator looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. He explained that Revolut had provided warnings to Mr W before releasing some of the payments. However, Mr W had provided inaccurate information to Revolut when it questioned him about the payments. The Investigator also explained that Mr W wasn't forthcoming during a call where Revolut attempted to discuss a payment but overall he thought the actions taken by it were proportionate to the risks it identified.

Mr W didn't agree with the outcome, so his complaint has been passed to me for review and 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've come to the same outcome as the Investigator for largely the same reasons. I'll explain why.

I'm aware that I've summarised this complaint briefly, in less detail than has been provided, and in my own words. No discourtesy is intended by this. Instead, I've focussed on what I think is the heart of the matter here. If there's something I have not mentioned, it isn't

because I have ignored it. I haven't. I'm satisfied I don't need to comment on every individual point or argument to be able to reach what I think is the right outcome. Our rules allow me to do this. This simply reflects the informal nature of our service as a free alternative to the courts.

I think it's important to note here that we have some missing information on the loss Mr W says he suffered as a result of this scam. We've been provided with some messages with the scammers, but these don't cover the initial scam payments. Mr W has also provided some statement data, but generally, I would expect to see some more evidence to link the disputed payments to a scam, before considering if Revolut should have done anything else to intervene in the payments.

However, I don't think this makes a difference to the outcome of Mr W's complaint because, like the Investigator, I agree that the interventions were proportionate to the risks Revolut identified at the time of the payments. So, I'm going to proceed on the basis that Mr W did suffer a loss to the scam he's described.

In broad terms, the starting position at law is that an Electronic Money Institution (EMI) such as Revolut is expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make, in accordance with the Payment Services Regulations (in this case the 2017 regulations) and the terms and conditions of the customer's account. But, taking into account relevant law, regulators rules and guidance, relevant codes of practice and what I consider to be 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,
- 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 confirmed it intervened on two of the payments Mr W had made. It recognised they were high-risk transactions and provided Mr W with advice and warnings to try and protect him from being scammed. It did this through its app. It also discussed the transactions with Mr W through its in-app chat service and by phone.

Revolut presented the following to Mr W on his first payment for £3,000:

"Do you know and trust this payee? If you're unsure, don't pay them, as we may not be able to help you get your money back. Remember, fraudsters can impersonate others, and we will never ask you to make a payment."

Revolut also highlighted to Mr W that his payments had been flagged by its systems as a potential scam and that to continue it needed to ask him some questions. As part of this it carried out further checks, undertaking a fraud risk assessment before processing his payments. Mr W confirmed he would answer any questions truthfully. He also confirmed he wasn't being pressured to make the payments or told what to say and that he wasn't being assisted or prompted to make the payments. He also advised that he had discovered the investment through a friend or family member and that the money he was transferring was to an account he controlled. However, he has since confirmed that he received an unsolicited call by a third party, who advised he could recover his lost cryptocurrency funds.

The warnings Revolut provided also highlighted the transfers may be a scam. It also highlighted that he should do research before making a payment as once funds have been received it's difficult to get back. Revolut also highlighted fraudsters can trick you into sending them money by promising high returns and might even have professional looking online platforms. These warnings were relevant to Mr W's circumstances so should have resonated with him.

I have also had a listen to the call Revolut made to discuss his payment for £4,600 and read through the in-app chat messages. Revolut attempted to find out more details about the payment Mr W was making and although it was able to learn some information, Mr W refused to provide further details to the agent he was talking to and was adamant that the payment should be sent. Mr W has since argued that Revolut missed an opportunity to prevent the scam from occurring during this call.

I have considered this point carefully. I appreciate that Mr W was not aware that he was falling victim to a scam, but where Revolut is not provided accurate information, or a customer fails to be open and transparent about the payments being made, it becomes significantly more difficult for a firm to identify a potential scam or to provide warnings relevant to the customer's specific situation. However, having considered the warnings it shared, I am satisfied that Revolut asked Mr W appropriate questions to ascertain the purpose of the transactions and to establish whether there was a risk of a scam. The answers Mr W provided wouldn't have led Revolut to think he might be falling for a scam. So, I think it would have been difficult for Revolut to provide Mr W with further advice on how to protect himself based on the information he had given it. Overall, based on the size of the payments, I think the actions Revolut took were proportionate to the risks it identified.

So, I would not have expected Revolut to do anything further before releasing the payments.

I understand that Mr W was experiencing some difficult circumstances at the time he fell victim to the scam. I'm sorry to learn about this, but I can't say that Revolut was or should have been aware that he was vulnerable or made any special adjustments for him at the time the transactions were made.

I'm also not persuaded Revolut could have done anything more to recover Mr W's funds. I say this because the payments were sent from Revolut to a cryptocurrency account in Mr W's name and then moved onto the scammers. So, I don't think there was any realistic prospect of Revolut recovering the funds.

My final decision

For the reasons I have explained, I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr W to accept or reject my decision before 17 March 2026.

Aleya Khanom
Ombudsman