

The complaint

Mr C has complained Revolut Bank Ltd lodged a fraud-related marker on the industry fraud database, CIFAS, in his name.

What happened

Mr C opened an account with Revolut in March 2023. In October 2024 Revolut restricted Mr C's account after getting a fraud notification from another bank who'd had numerous payments made from their account. These payments had gone to another account Mr C held (with a bank I'll call C). Mr C had then transferred this money from his account with C to his Revolut account. There'd then been some crypto purchases and cash withdrawals.

Revolut confirmed that they were closing Mr C's account. They also lodged a fraud-related marker on the CIFAS database.

In March 2025 Mr C asked Revolut to remove the marker. Revolut confirmed they'd done nothing wrong and wouldn't remove the marker.

Mr C brought his complaint to the ombudsman service.

Our investigator noted Mr C's evidence that he'd been led into being a money mule but as soon as he'd realised this was fraudulent, he'd alerted his banks. However, she was concerned that he still referred to the money in his Revolut account being the result of him selling domestic items.

As our investigator felt Mr C had knowingly accepted fraudulent funds, she confirmed that Revolut had enough evidence to lodge a CIFAS marker.

Disappointed with this outcome, Mr C has asked an ombudsman to review his complaint.

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 reached the same outcome as our investigator. I'll explain why.

It is clear what the requirements are prior to lodging a marker. Specifically:

“There must be reasonable grounds to believe that an identified fraud or financial crime has been committed or attempted.

The evidence must be clear, relevant and rigorous.”

Revolut must be able to provide clear evidence that an identified fraud was being committed, and Mr C was involved. This means that they must have more than a suspicion or a concern that Mr C may be involved.

There's also a requirement that Revolut should be giving the account holder an opportunity to explain what was going on.

I've seen the evidence provided by Revolut. This confirms that they received a complaint from C that one of their customers had been a fraud victim. The money from this customer's account had been transferred to Mr C's account with C. Those 11 payments had then been transferred in the early hours of 4 October 2024 to Mr C's Revolut account.

As Revolut had received a fraudulent report and no real response from Mr C about what these payments were – apart from transfers from his own account – they decided they had sufficient evidence to close his account and lodge a CIFAS marker.

In Mr C's initial submission to our service, he accepted that he had given his bank details to a third party *"in return of a % of money"*. He'd been led to believe that his profit would be as much as £5,000-10,000. He's told us that he thought this was the proceeds of crypto investment.

I've noted what Mr C's told us but find it hard to believe he really expected as much as £10,000 *"with no risk"*. I've noted his powerful testimony about his personal circumstances, but I think he always knew he was involved in something pretty dodgy.

He opened two other bank accounts – one with C – under instruction. He allowed other devices to be linked to his account. And he's since told us a story about selling domestic items which explained why he'd received this money. But this isn't credible as these transactions don't match the dates of these disputed transactions.

Mr C has shared evidence that he notified his other two banks on 6 October (so after receiving the funds, and withdrawing the cash) that he'd been persuaded to act as a money mule. But there's no evidence he also told Revolut or that he made any effort to give up the funds that I can see he benefitted from.

I think the evidence shows Mr C was in receipt of fraudulent funds and importantly knew that this was the case.

In accordance with the rules about lodging a marker, I have no choice but to accept that Revolut acted properly. On this basis, I don't believe it would be fair and reasonable to ask Revolut to remove the CIFAS marker.

That said, I notice Revolut confirmed to us that the CIFAS marker was lodged on 17 October 2024, which would follow as this was the date they decided to close Mr C's account. For whatever reason, this isn't what happened. The CIFAS marker wasn't lodged until 21 February 2025. I believe that will be having an unfair impact on Mr C by extending the period this applies to him whilst it should have been lodged immediately.

On that basis I will be asking Revolut to update Mr C's record with CIFAS and ensure that this marker comes off his record on 17 October 2027.

My final decision

For the reasons given, my final decision is to instruct Revolut Ltd to update Mr C's CIFAS marker so that this is effectively lodged on 17 October 2024.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr C to accept or reject my decision before 9 March 2026.

Sandra Quinn
Ombudsman