

## **The complaint**

Mr F complains that Revolut Ltd unfairly restricted and closed his account.

## **What happened**

Mr F says he opened his account with Revolut in December 2024. Following verification, he received his associated card and added funds to the account in January this year. Following failed attempts to receive and make payments, Mr F found that his account had been restricted. Revolut later informed him that his account has been terminated.

Mr F is unhappy with the firm's decision to do so. He says he urgently needed funds for medication, and the restriction prevented him from accessing the funds he needed. Mr F says he had to borrow funds to pay for essentials like medication and food. He adds that he is diagnosed with certain medical conditions, and the stress of this experience caused hardship and worsened his health.

Revolut issued its response, concluding that it had acted fairly. Mr F remained unhappy and asked this service to independently review his complaint. He wants the firm to pay him over £2,000 compensation. He adds that Revolut provided conflicting messaging, vague responses and delayed access to his funds. Mr F says Revolut should have shown consideration for his vulnerability.

Our investigator issued their outcome, explaining that the firm acted fairly. Mr F doesn't agree and asked for a final decision. So the complaint has been passed to me.

## **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.

I'd like to start by saying that I've considered all the arguments and evidence provided by both parties, but in this decision, I'll be referring to and focusing on what I consider to be the main points. No discourtesy is intended by this. We aim for our decisions to be as concise as possible.

Revolut has important legal and regulatory responsibilities to meet when providing accounts to customers. These obligations are ongoing and don't only apply when an account is opened. They can broadly be summarised as a responsibility to know its customers, monitor accounts, verify the source and purpose of the funds as well as detect and prevent financial harm. Revolut may need to review accounts to comply with these responsibilities.

I've also considered the basis for Revolut's review, which I find was legitimate and in line with its legal and regulatory obligations. I should also add that I don't think Revolut is under any obligation to disclose to its customers what triggers a review of their accounts. For this reason, I can't say that it's done anything wrong by not giving Mr F this information. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to require it to do so.

Revolut's terms and conditions say that it can close an account by giving two months' notice or with immediate effect in certain circumstances. Having looked at all the evidence and the terms and conditions, I'm satisfied that HSBC was acting fairly and reasonably when it decided to close the account. Revolut says it provided Mr F with notice, but its communications suggest the closure was immediate. Nevertheless, I'm satisfied its decision was fair.

Revolut has provided some further details of its decision-making process which, unfortunately, I can't share due to its commercial sensitivity. But I've seen nothing to suggest that Revolut's decision around closing Mr F's account was unfair.

Furthermore, it's generally for firms to decide whether to provide or continue to provide banking facilities to a particular customer. Each financial institution has its own criteria and risk assessments for deciding whether to open or close accounts, and providing an account to a customer is a commercial decision that a firm is entitled to take. Unless there's a very good reason to do so, this service won't usually say that a firm must keep a customer or require it to compensate a customer who has had their account closed.

Mr F understandably would like to know the reason why Revolut decided to close his account. As I said above, Revolut doesn't need to give him a reason why, as much as he'd like it to. The same would apply to Mr L if he had decided to change to another bank.

I empathise with Mr F, because the restriction and closure caused him difficulties. And I can understand why he would have been distressed, given he urgently required medication. But I can only consider issuing an award for the impact on Mr F, where I conclude that Revolut has treated him unfairly. As I've explained, I don't think it did. So I won't be asking the firm to pay compensation.

I recognise that Mr F found the differing messaging from Revolut to be frustrating, especially as he's continued to receive communications even after the firm has decided to close his account. But the process that Revolut applies as part of its review isn't something I have the power to interfere in. Such a process is a commercial decision that only Revolut can influence, with intervention from the regulator where necessary. So, although I empathise with Mr F, I won't be asking Revolut to do anything in relation to the service issues he points to.

Mr F also claims there was a delay in the return of his funds. However, I note from his transaction history that he transferred the bulk of the account balance out to another one of his accounts at the end of January. The £0.64 that remained was sent to him in May. So I'm satisfied Mr F was reasonably able to access the funds in his account.

I appreciate that the restriction on his account prevented some other payments from entering his account. But given I'm satisfied the restriction was applied fairly, I won't be concluding that Revolut unfairly prevented Mr F from being able to make use of these funds. Moreover, it seems Mr F had access to other banking facilities elsewhere and the payments in question were sent to him by third parties – so I can't see why it would have been unreasonable for him to receive these funds via other means.

Overall, I'm satisfied Revolut acted fairly when it restricted and closed Mr F's account. So I won't be asking the firm to do anything.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons explained above, I'm not upholding this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr F to accept or reject my decision before 16 January 2026.

Abdul Ali  
**Ombudsman**