

The complaint

Mr S complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund money he says he lost when he was a victim of a scam.

Mr S is professionally represented, however, to keep things simple, I'll refer to Mr S throughout my decision.

What happened

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties and so I'll only refer to some key events here.

In 2025, Mr S fell victim to a task-based job scam. He saw a remote working opportunity advertised on social media and after expressing his interest, he was contacted on an instant messenger application and told that the job opportunity involved helping "rate movies with 5-star reviews to boost cinema ratings". Mr S was also told he had to make deposits in order to complete sets of tasks, earning him commission ranging from £0.60 - £1 per task, which included special ticket tasks where you can earn 5 or 10 times the regular commission rate. Mr S realised he had been scammed when the deposit amounts kept increasing and becoming more frequent, and he was being pressurised to continue making the payments and told he couldn't make any withdrawals until the payments had been made.

Mr S complained to Revolut, and his complaint wasn't upheld. Unhappy with Revolut's response, Mr S raised the matter with the Ombudsman Service. One of our Investigators looked into the complaint and didn't uphold it. The Investigator said the withdrawal of crypto from Mr S's account wasn't a regulated activity. But the acceptance of funds and then the exchanges were activities that this service had the power to investigate. The Investigator went on to say, Revolut gave appropriate warnings during the scam journey, and based on the answers Mr S provided, he didn't take on board the warnings provided and chose to continue making the payments. So, he didn't think any earlier intervention at the exchange stage would have made a difference and Mr S would have continued to make the exchanges.

Mr S didn't agree with the Investigator. In short, he said. Revolut should have provided in-app or human intervention at an earlier point in the exchange journey. And had this action been taken, the scam would have been uncovered and his loss would have been prevented. Mr S also said, the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) Consumer Duty regulation has made it clear that firms need to avoid foreseeable harm to their customers, and the failure of Revolut to effectively intervene at any stage demonstrates a failure to prevent foreseeable harm to him and a failure of the firm under Consumer Duty.

As no agreement could be reached, the complaint has been passed to me for 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.

Our service can't consider every complaint that's brought to us. The rules that say when we can look at a complaint are set by the FCA in their dispute resolution rules (DISP rules). Here Mr S exchanged funds into cryptocurrency before sending them externally. Cryptocurrency transactions are not a regulated activity so I find the sending of cryptocurrency externally is not something that I can consider.

However, I have considered the events leading up to the sending of the funds externally. I find the accepting of deposits into Mr S's account a regulated or otherwise covered activity and the exchange of fiat money to cryptocurrency an ancillary activity. Therefore, I'm satisfied this part of the payment journey is something that I can consider. Having done so, I agree with the outcome our Investigator reached and for similar reasons. I know this will be disappointing to Mr S but I'll explain my reasons why.

Mr S has also highlighted other decisions issued by our service to support his argument that Revolut should have done more here to protect him from financial harm. I understand why this is something Mr S would like me to consider, but each case our service looks at is reviewed on its own merits and I'm afraid I can't comment on conclusions we've reached on previous complaints.

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.

Considering the relevant: law and regulations; regulators' rules, guidance and standards; codes of practice; and, where appropriate, what I consider to be good industry practice at the time - Revolut should fairly and reasonably:

- Have been monitoring accounts 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 payment service providers are generally more familiar with than the average customer.
- In some circumstances, take additional steps, or make additional checks, before processing a payment, or in some cases decline it altogether, to help protect customers from the possibility of financial harm from fraud.
- 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.

However, as mentioned above I can only consider the events leading up to the sending of the funds externally. So, I've thought about whether the deposits or exchanges should have highlighted to Revolut that Mr S might be at a heightened risk of financial harm from fraud.

Here, having reviewed Mr S's account activity, I do agree with the Investigator that the exchange that Mr S carried out on 17 May 2025 for £4,160 was unusual and that Revolut should have explored if Mr S was at risk of financial harm. I've also taken notice of Mr S's argument that the intervention should have taken place on the earlier exchange on the same day for £1,947. However, as the Investigator has mentioned, I don't think it makes a difference here, even if I agree that Revolut should have intervened earlier when Mr S said

they should have, because for me to find it fair and reasonable that Revolut should refund Mr S his losses require more than a finding that Revolut ought to have intervened. I would need to find not only that Revolut failed to intervene where they ought to have done so, or in the way they ought to have done - but crucially I'd need to find that but for this failure the subsequent loss would have been avoided.

The latter element concerns causation. A proportionate intervention will not always result in the prevention of a payment. And if I find it more likely than not that such a proportionate intervention by Revolut wouldn't have revealed the payments were part of a fraud or scam, then I can't fairly hold it liable for not having prevented them from being made.

I can see that Revolut did intervene prior to processing some of Mr S's cryptocurrency withdrawals on the same day (17 May 2025) and provided him with advice and warnings to try and protect him from being scammed. I can't assess whether that intervention was proportionate, as it happened during a part of the cryptocurrency process that doesn't fall within our jurisdiction. But I think that interaction is a good indication of what would likely have happened if Mr S had received warnings prior to the second exchange he made. In doing so, I also think they met their obligations under the Consumer Duty. And I don't think they needed to do anything else.

During these interventions, Revolut initially provided Mr S with the following warning as he was making payments to a new beneficiary:

“Do you know and trust the 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 asked Mr S if he was being guided and what the transactions were for on five separate occasions, so it could provide advice on it. Mr S answered that he wasn't being prompted to make the payment and he was transferring money to his other account with another bank in his control on each occasion. He also advised he wasn't told to download any software. Revolut then showed Mr S a series of warnings, including highlighting this could be a scam and that scammers often promise high returns in a short period of time and might even have professional-looking online platforms. If Mr S had explained he was being pressurised to make the payment and answered some of the other questions more accurately than it also could have helped Revolut identify whether it ought to have taken additional steps to try and protect Mr S from a scam.

It's clear that Mr S trusted what he was being told by the scammers about the job opportunity and the commission he could earn and that he was willing to provide inaccurate information in order to get the transactions processed. So, I don't think he would have revealed much about the circumstances around the exchange of £1,947 or £4,160 on 17 May 2025, if Revolut had intervened on it. On balance, I believe Mr S would have answered the questions in a similar way as he had done with the cryptocurrency withdrawals and that it would have been processed.

The circumstances weren't risky enough, and based on the size of the transaction, I wouldn't have expected further checks, such as an agent speaking with Mr S. So, I don't find that Revolut could likely or reasonably have stopped Mr S from exchanging his funds, and I don't think it could have prevented the loss to the scammers. And so, it wouldn't be fair or reasonable for me to hold Revolut liable for his loss. Also, the sending of crypto isn't a payment that can be reversed. So, there were no further means for Revolut to try and recover the crypto withdrawals.

I appreciate Mr S will be disappointed by this outcome. But it would only be fair for me to direct Revolut to refund his loss if I thought they were responsible – and I'm not persuaded that this was the case. For the above reasons, I think Revolut have acted fairly and so I'm not going to tell them to do anything further.

My final decision

My final decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

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

Israr Ahmed
Ombudsman