

The complaint

Mr S complains about the actions of Revolut Ltd when he lost money to a scam.

What happened

The detailed background to this complaint is well known to both parties. So, I'll only provide a brief overview of some of the key events here.

Around the summer of 2025 Mr S's wife received messages on a messaging platform about an investment opportunity with a merchant (scammer). Mr S's wife made some payments from her own account before the scammers asked for money to withdraw profits. Mr S was instructed by the scammers to open an account with Revolut and open wallets with two genuine crypto exchanges. He then sent in total around £4,109.80 to two genuine crypto exchanges from his Revolut account on 09 July 2025. After Mr S and his wife didn't receive any withdrawals, they realised it was a scam. So, Mr S raised a claim with Revolut who said it wouldn't offer him a refund as it hadn't done anything wrong. As a result, Mr S brought his complaint to this service.

Our Investigator didn't think the complaint should be upheld. She said that Revolut stopped the first payment Mr S made and asked him some questions, but it wasn't provided with accurate information because Mr S was being heavily coached by the scammer. So, she didn't think Revolut could've reasonably uncovered the scam.

Mr S disagreed and asked for an Ombudsman's review. He said Revolut should've done more to stop the scam by providing stronger interventions and warnings which would've uncovered the scam. He added that he was vulnerable to the scam which should've been considered by Revolut here.

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 conclusion as our investigator. And for largely the same reasons. I'm sorry to hear that Mr S has been the victim of a cruel scam. I know he feels strongly about this complaint, and this will come as a disappointment to him, so I'll explain why.

I've read and considered the whole file. But I'll concentrate my comments on what I think is relevant. If I don't mention any specific point, it's not because I've failed to take it on board and think about it, but because I don't think I need to comment on it to reach what I think is a fair and reasonable outcome.

Where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive, or contradictory (as it is here), I have to make my decision on the balance of probabilities – that is, what I consider is more likely than not to have happened in the light of the available evidence and the wider surrounding circumstances.

It is common ground that Mr S authorised the scam payments of around £4,109.80. I accept that these were authorised payments even though Mr S was the victim of a scam. So, although it wasn't his intention to pay money to the scammers, under the Payment Services Regulations 2017 (PSRs) and the terms of his account, Mr S is presumed liable for the loss in the first instance.

However, taking into account the law, regulatory rules and guidance, relevant codes of practice and good industry practice, there are circumstances where it might be appropriate for Revolut to take additional steps or make additional checks before processing a payment in order to help protect customers from the possibility of financial harm from fraud.

Revolut's first obligation is to follow the instructions that Mr S provides. But if those instructions are sufficiently unusual or uncharacteristic for the account, I'd expect Revolut to intervene and to ask their customer more about the intended transaction before processing it. I'd also expect Revolut to provide suitable warnings about common scams to help their customers make an informed decision as to whether to continue with the payment. There might also be cases where it's appropriate for Revolut to refuse to follow the instruction if there are good grounds to believe it is being made as a result of a fraud or scam.

Our Investigator felt Revolut reasonably stopped the first payment here and asked Mr S questions about why he was making it. She added that Revolut should've provided a crypto investment scam warning instead of an investment one. But that this wouldn't have made a difference here due to the coaching Mr S was receiving. Mr S said Revolut only provided generic warnings and it should've called him to make sure he wasn't being scammed. I've considered what Mr S has said carefully, but I don't find what he has said to be more persuasive here. I'll explain why.

When Revolut stopped the first payment Mr S failed to provide accurate responses to its questions under guidance from the scammer. Revolut even said that if anyone was telling him to ignore the warnings then they were a scammer, but this was ignored. I agree with the Investigator that Revolut should've provided a crypto investment scam warning on that first payment given where it was being sent. But because Mr S was copying and pasting the questions Revolut asked to the scammer, I don't consider it more likely than not that he would've headed a crypto investment scam warning. Mr S thought this was a genuine opportunity and was happy to allow the scammer to give him answers to Revolut's questions – even ones where Revolut were asking him if someone was guiding him and telling him what to say. So, even if Revolut had provided stronger warnings, I don't think Mr S would've taken notice of those. He was happy to be coached and told what to say. So, any further questions and warnings from Revolut would've likely been sent to the scammer for assistance on how to send the money to the crypto exchanges. This shows me that Mr S had more likely than not reached a point where he would've followed the advice and direction of the scammer regardless of the warnings he should've been presented with.

I note Mr S has said Revolut should've called him to discuss the first payment or any of the others. But I don't think Revolut would've been sufficiently suspicious of the answers Mr S was providing at the time to have gone further and requested such a call. Nor do I think the later payments made on the same day would've given Revolut enough concern to make a call to him. Those payments were smaller individually than the first and Mr S had been clear (at the direction of the scammer) that he was investing for himself and wanted to be able to invest his money. So, I don't think Revolut treated Mr S unfairly by not offering to call him on that day.

Recovery

Because Mr S made the payment by card the chargeback process is relevant here. However, Revolut would only be able to raise a chargeback against the crypto exchanges – not the scammer. And the crypto exchanges provided the service that Mr S asked it to – to provide the crypto and forward it to the scammers. So, Revolut didn't treat Mr S unfairly by not pursuing a chargeback here.

Mr S raised some vulnerabilities here but because Revolut wasn't aware of these at the time of the payments, I can't reasonably ask it to reconsider the claim based upon something it wasn't aware of at the time of the payments.

I'm sorry Mr S lost the money to a scam here but for the reasons I've outlined I'm not going to ask Revolut to do anything further here.

My final decision

My final decision is that I don't 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 31 December 2025.

Mark Dobson
Ombudsman