

The complaint and background

Mr E complains Revolut won't reimburse over £10,000 that he lost when he fell victim to a cryptocurrency investment scam.

Our investigator didn't uphold the complaint. He found that Revolut provided Mr E with a warning during the second payment relevant to the payment purpose he'd given. He was persuaded Revolut's actions at the time were proportionate to the risk associated with the payment and wouldn't have expected it to have intervened further. And although he considered Revolut ought to have taken this action on the first payment instead, he was satisfied Mr E would still wanted to have proceeded with the payment.

Mr E disagreed. He explained that he could accept if Revolut had intervened on the first payment and with less concern for the second payment. He says that if Revolut would have spelt out the risks and dangers when he made the first payment, he would not have gone ahead with the payment. He says he would have trusted Revolut and would not have made the payment. And as a result of this failure by Revolut, he doesn't consider any payments to the scam would have been made.

Our investigator responded to Mr E explaining that upon review of the evidence provided by Revolut, they had in fact provided a warning during the first payment and not the second. Given the other comments he'd already provided in his investigation alongside Mr E's response to his findings, his outcome remained the same – that he didn't uphold the complaint.

As an agreement couldn't be reached, the case has been passed to me to decide.

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.

It isn't in dispute that Mr E authorised the transactions in question. He is therefore presumed liable for the loss in the first instance. However, Revolut is aware, taking longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements into account, and what I consider to be good industry practice at the time, that it should have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and made additional checks before processing payments in some circumstances.

Revolut did find the first payment of £5,001 made on 20 June 2022 suspicious as it made some further enquiries of Mr E during the payment process. Mr E was asked to provide a payment purpose from the options available – he answered 'Investment'. Revolut has provided evidence of the warning Mr E would have received in-app during the payment process detailing the risks and the high probability it considered this payment is a scam. It set out what Mr E could do to verify that he is dealing with a genuine investment company/opportunity and that he should only purchase cryptocurrencies from reputable companies. It also set out that scammers will typically promise significantly higher than market returns to attract you to the opportunity whilst also warning that Mr E may risk losing money that Revolut may not be able to recover.

I'm persuaded Revolut's actions at the time when cryptocurrency scams were less prevalent than they are now, was proportionate to the risk associated with the payment.

Like our investigator, I'm satisfied that despite the warning, Mr E still wanted to go ahead with the payment as he did. At the time of making these payments, Mr E had previously been introduced and had physically met with the scammer whilst playing golf. He was also in regular contact with the scammer and Mr E considered they held a deep and professional knowledge about investments. Furthermore, Mr E has described the website and portal he was provided by the scammer as appearing '*professional and sophisticated*'.

For completeness, I would not have expected Revolut to have taken any further action in relation to the second payment made two months later as the payee was established at the time.

I'm also not persuaded there were any prospects of Revolut successfully recovering the funds, given the length of time it had taken for the fraud to be reported and considering the money was used to purchase cryptocurrency from a legitimate provider before those assets were transferred onwards as part of the scam.

My final decision

For the reasons set out above, I don't uphold Mr E's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr E to accept or reject my decision before 4 February 2026.

Mark O'Connor
Ombudsman