

## **The complaint**

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

The complaint is brought on Mr M's behalf by a professional representative.

## **What happened**

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties, so I won't repeat everything here. In summary, Mr M has explained that between January and August 2023 he made payments from his Revolut account to buy cryptocurrency which he ultimately lost to an investment scam.

Mr M filled in an online enquiry after seeing an advert promoting a cryptocurrency investment with a company I will refer to as Z. After being contacted by a representative of Z ("the scammer"), he opened an account on its platform. Mr M has told us he was asked to verify his identity before he could sign up to Z's platform which made him think that he was dealing with a genuine company. Mr M also explained that he built a rapport with the scammers. The scammer, through remote access software, helped Mr M set up accounts with legitimate cryptocurrency exchanges. Most of the payments were sent using one cryptocurrency exchange (which I will refer to as "B"). Believing it was a legitimate investment he started to invest.

Mr M has explained that by the end of May 2023 his profits were around \$400,000 and so he asked to withdraw his funds. However, he was asked to pay fees to do this and was given various reasons for them, which he says he paid between June and August 2023. Mr M thought he had paid all the necessary fees when the scammer requested further funds. It was at this point he realised he had been scammed. Mr M has told us he sent the scammers a total of £225,986.25 as a result of the scam.

Mr M raised a complaint with Revolut. It investigated the complaint but didn't uphold it. It didn't think it had done anything wrong by allowing the payments to go through. So, Mr M brought his complaint to our service.

Our Investigator looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. She sent Mr M and Revolut a number of views following information she had been provided but ultimately, she concluded that from the evidence she had seen, she couldn't safely say Mr M had suffered a loss to a scam.

Mr M's complaint has now been passed to me for review and a 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'm not upholding Mr M's complaint. 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 that 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've thought about the Contingent Reimbursement Model Code (CRM Code) which can offer a potential means of obtaining a refund following scams like this one. But as Revolut isn't a signatory of the CRM Code, these payments aren't covered under it. I've therefore considered whether Revolut should reimburse Mr M under any of its other obligations.

In line with the Payment Services Regulations 2017, consumers are generally liable for payments they authorise. Revolut is expected to process authorised payment instructions without undue delay. But it also has long-standing obligations to help protect customers from financial harm from fraud and scams.

Those obligations are however predicated on there having been a fraud or scam, and on the consumer having suffered a loss as a result. And so, it would only be reasonable for me to consider if Revolut's actions, or inactions, led to Mr M suffering a loss as the result of a scam, if I am satisfied that Mr M has been the victim of, and lost funds as the result of a scam.

Although Mr M has provided some testimony about how he became involved in the scam, most of the information he has supplied from Z is generic and it doesn't link Mr M to the scam or demonstrate that he was a victim of it. He's sent us some emails with investment projections, emails where he asks Z to call him and emails with links to videos on social media. These emails contain very limited information and they don't confirm that Mr M might have been scammed. They also don't cover the full scam period.

Mr M hasn't supplied any evidence where the scam is discussed. For example, he hasn't sent us any information between him and Z discussing the investment he was agreeing to, any paperwork relating to the investment, any emails where he provided his identification details or any correspondence where the scammer has requested him to pay fees in order to get his funds released. Mr M explained that in addition to emails he was dealing with Z by phone and through a messaging app but we haven't been sent any messages from the app. Mr M transferred substantial funds over a period of eight months so in the circumstances I would expect to see some more evidence to link the disputed payments to a scam.

There is information on the Financial Conduct Authority's (FCA) website that suggests that Z was a clone of an FCA authorised firm. But the limited information Mr M has shared doesn't demonstrate that he may have been dealing with the cloned firm.

Mr M has provided information from his account with B which shows he made payments for cryptocurrency using its platform, but he's not been able to supply evidence to show how the funds he sent using B were subsequently lost to scammers. We have been sent emails with wallet addresses from Z, but these addresses aren't included in any of the transfers he's made, so they don't demonstrate that the payments he made to B were as a result of a scam.

I can see why Mr M believes this was a scam based on some of the other information he has supplied us which seems to demonstrate some unrealistic returns. But I do need to see sufficient evidence to show that he has suffered a loss due to a scam before I can go on to

consider if Revolut should have intervened in any of the payments he says he made to the scam. And I don't have enough evidence of this here.

Mr M has also requested compensation in addition to a refund of the scam payments made. But I can't see any reason which would suggest compensation is warranted in the circumstances of the complaint as I have not found anything to suggest Revolut have acted incorrectly.

For completeness, I have also considered if Revolut could have done anything to recover Mr M's funds once he reported what had happened. But it's difficult to see how recovery would have ever been possible here given what Mr M said about converting the funds into cryptocurrency and sending it on to the scammers.

I'm sorry to disappoint Mr M but for the above reasons I won't be asking Revolut to do anything further.

### **My final decision**

My final decision is that I'm not upholding this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr M to accept or reject my decision before 4 December 2025.

Aleya Khanom  
**Ombudsman**