

The complaint

Mr J complains that Revolut Ltd unfairly restricted his account.

What happened

Mr J complained to Revolut after it restricted his account for several days without prior notice or an explanation. He says he'd been expecting his benefit payment and funds from a third party, which he needed to pay for essential living costs. Mr J says he'd been recovering from surgery at the time so couldn't get around easily and that Revolut's actions caused his health to seriously deteriorate. He also says an employment opportunity was affected.

The restriction was lifted after a few days, but Mr J says he didn't gain access to his funds straight away due to the restriction being lifted ahead of a bank holiday period. He adds that he received a poor level service from Revolut via its webchat. Revolut's response said that it had acted in line with its terms. The firm also paid Mr J £25 compensation as a goodwill gesture.

In referring his complaint to this service, Mr J seeks further compensation and a refund of fees he incurred due to late bill payments. One of our investigators issued their outcome, asking Revolut to pay Mr J £50 compensation for delays. Revolut didn't agree, so the complaint has been passed to me for a final review.

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 recently asked Mr J for further information and provided my conclusions on this complaint alongside this request, should he be unable to respond with the information I'd asked for. Mr J hasn't been able to provide the information I've asked for, and I'm satisfied that the requested information could have been acquired by him. So I've decided to issue my final decision – which is that I'm not upholding this complaint.

Revolut is strictly regulated and must take certain actions to meet its legal and regulatory obligations when providing account services to customers. These obligations can broadly be summarised as a responsibility to know its customer, monitor accounts, verify the source and purpose of funds, as well as detect and prevent other harm.

To comply with its legal and regulatory obligations, financial businesses will review their customers' accounts, which can either be periodic or event driven. And this often results in businesses restricting accounts as specified in the account terms. Having looked at all the evidence and information in this case, I'm satisfied that Revolut's reasons for review were in line with its terms and obligations.

I appreciate that this was a difficult experience for Mr J. He says he was unable to pay for essential living costs, which seriously affected his health and resulted in him incurring fees. I can understand it would have been challenging for Mr J, particularly as the review took

several days. But I can only instruct Revolut to pay compensation where I conclude that its act in restricting Mr J's account was unfair. As I've explained, I don't find that it was, so I won't be making a compensation award.

Our investigator upheld the complaint because Revolut's review spanned several days, and the firm has been unable to explain why this was the case. So the investigator felt Mr J should be compensated for being deprived of access to banking facilities during this period. However, I recently asked Mr J about another bank account he seemed to have had at the time – his Revolut statements show transactions to and from an account in his name. Mr J was asked to provide statements for this account from around the time of the restriction, but he's been unable to do so.

So I've been unable to establish the status of this account, whether it had funds Mr J could have used at the time or if he could have received funds into this account instead. Therefore, I can't fairly reach a finding that Revolut's decision to restrict Mr J's account prevented him from accessing banking facilities to a degree that would persuade me that compensation would be fair. I also acknowledge that Revolut could have conducted its review more efficiently, but I haven't seen enough evidence that this impacted Mr J in the way that he says.

Mr J says he found Revolut's service over webchat to be rude and dismissive. I've reviewed the chat and can see that he was in contact with Revolut throughout the period of the restriction, asking for updates and highlighting his need for the restriction to be lifted. I appreciate it would have been frustrating for Mr J to have received repetitive responses with each instance of contact. But I haven't seen any evidence that Revolut provided a poor level of service in the way Mr J describes.

For these reasons, I've decided not to uphold this complaint, and I won't be asking Revolut to pay any compensation.

My final decision

I'm not upholding this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr J to accept or reject my decision before 24 March 2026.

Abdul Ali
Ombudsman