

## **The complaint**

Ms K complains that Revolut Ltd hasn't protected her from losing money to a scam.

## **What happened**

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties, so I won't repeat everything here. In brief summary, between April and July 2024 Ms K made numerous transactions through her Revolut account for what she thought was a legitimate investment. Ms K got in touch with Revolut to report that she'd been scammed. Ultimately, Revolut didn't reimburse Ms K's lost funds, and Ms K referred her complaint about Revolut to us. As our Investigator couldn't resolve the matter informally, the case has been passed to me for a 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.

I'm very aware that I've summarised this complaint briefly, in less detail than has been provided, and in my own words. No discourtesy is intended by this. Instead, I've focused on what I think is the heart of the matter. If there's something I've not mentioned, it isn't because I've ignored it – I haven't. I'm satisfied I don't need to comment on every individual point or argument to be able to reach what I think is the right outcome. Our rules allow me to do this, reflecting the informal nature of our service as a free alternative to the courts.

Having done so, I've decided to not uphold Ms K's complaint for materially the same reasons as our Investigator. There's no need for me to repeat these reasons here again, but in summary:

- I don't doubt Ms K has been the victim of a cruel scam here. I'd like to acknowledge everything Ms K has said and that she's lost a very significant amount of money indeed. Fraud like this has a significant emotional impact too, and Ms K has my heartfelt sympathy. Ultimately, however, Ms K has suffered her loss because of fraudsters, and this doesn't automatically entitle her to a refund from Revolut. In a case like this, it would only be fair for me to tell Revolut to reimburse Ms K her loss (or part of it) if I thought Revolut reasonably ought to have prevented the transactions (or some of them) in the first place, or Revolut unreasonably hindered recovery of the funds after the transactions had been made; and if I was satisfied, overall, this was a fair and reasonable outcome.
- As our Investigator explained, at the time of the transactions Revolut did intervene many times by asking questions and warning Ms K about fraud and scams. Our Investigator explained this in some detail which I won't repeat here. This included warning Ms K about some important red flags, and serious warnings about her being scammed if she was being guided on how to answer Revolut's queries, and if she'd been asked to install remote access software. Unfortunately, however, Ms K wasn't upfront with her answers. I'm persuaded that this is likely because Ms K was under the spell of the scam and the scammers. The way she interacted with Revolut during

its interventions persuades me of this, along with the nature of Ms K's WhatsApp chats with the scammers – which show Ms K taking guidance from the scammer(s) on how to navigate Revolut's questions about the payments.

- I've carefully considered everything Ms K's representative has said, including its points that Revolut ought to have escalated its interventions to a telephone call, and that there was a potential language barrier that could have impacted Ms K's understanding of warnings and advice provided, which Revolut ought to have taken into account. But I agree with our Investigator that the information indicates Ms K was able to understand and respond to Revolut, including providing clear answers to Revolut's questions, signing risk acknowledgements, and so on. Like our Investigator, I'm not persuaded it was a language barrier that caused Ms K to proceed with the transactions despite this. Nor am I persuaded that a phone call or any more robust intervention is likely to have changed anything here. Ultimately, it looks like Ms K would have unfortunately been intent on proceeding with the transactions in any event, in the face of many clear warnings that she was in all likelihood being scammed. I have to be fair and unfortunately it seems that no matter what Revolut had reasonably done here, it's likely the scammers would have been able to continue to trick and persuade Ms K to make such transactions towards the scam. I therefore don't think it would be fair to hold Revolut responsible for Ms K's making these transactions and her loss in the circumstances of this case.
- I've considered whether Revolut unreasonably missed an opportunity to recover the funds for Ms K. Unfortunately, however, we know that fraudsters tend to move funds on quickly after receipt to frustrate recovery. Our Investigator explained the position with regards to cryptocurrency. And I understand in the circumstances of this case, recovery of the bank transfers was never likely to be successful given how quickly those funds were likely spent. I also think Revolut didn't act unreasonably in seeking clarity from Ms K regarding some of the payees, and that I can't fairly say Revolut should fairly be held responsible for the funds not being recoverable.

I'm really sorry Ms K was scammed and lost so much money. But despite my natural sympathy, I can't fairly tell Revolut to reimburse her in circumstances where I'm not persuaded it reasonably ought to have been expected to prevent her loss.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons explained, I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Ms K to accept or reject my decision before 29 December 2025.

Neil Bridge  
**Ombudsman**