

The complaint

Ms D complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund the full amount of money she lost to a scam.

What happened

The background to this complaint is well-known to both parties, so I won't repeat it in detail here. But in summary and based on the submissions of both parties, I understand it to be as follows.

Ms D complains that she sent several payments to what she thought was a legitimate task-based job.

When Ms D realised she had lost her money, she raised a complaint with Revolut.

Revolut looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. So, Ms D brought her complaint to our service.

Our investigator looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. Our investigator found Revolut did intervene, but Ms D didn't give accurate answers to its questions.

As Ms D didn't agree with the investigator's view, the complaint has been passed to me to decide.

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 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 significant part here. If there's something I've not mentioned, it isn't because I've ignored it. 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. This simply reflects the informal nature of our service as a free alternative to the courts.

I don't doubt Ms D has been the victim of a scam here – she has lost a considerable sum of money and has my sympathy for this. However, just because a scam has occurred, it does not mean Ms D is automatically entitled to recompense by Revolut. It would only be fair for me to tell Revolut to reimburse Ms D for her loss (or a proportion of it) if: I thought Revolut reasonably ought to have prevented all (or some of) the payments Ms D made, or Revolut hindered the recovery of the payments – whilst ultimately being satisfied that such an outcome was fair and reasonable for me to reach.

I've thought carefully about whether Revolut treated Ms D fairly and reasonably in its dealings with her, when she made the payments and when she reported the scam, or whether it should have done more than it did. Having done so, I've decided to not uphold Ms D's complaint. I know this will come as a disappointment to Ms D and so I will explain below

why I've reached the decision I have.

I have kept in mind that Ms D made the payments herself and the starting position is that Revolut should follow its customer's instructions. So, under the Payment Services Regulations 2017 (PSR 2017) she is presumed liable for the loss in the first instance. I appreciate that Ms D did not intend for her money to ultimately go to fraudsters – but she did authorise these payments to take place. However, there are some situations when a firm should have had a closer look at the wider circumstances surrounding a transaction before allowing it to be made.

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 and any payments made or received to counter various risks, including anti-money laundering, countering the financing of terrorism, and 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, irrespective of the payment channel used, have taken additional steps, or make additional checks, before processing a payment, or in some cases decline to make a payment altogether, to help protect customers from the possibility of financial harm from fraud.

So, I've thought about whether the transactions should have highlighted to Revolut that Ms D might be at a heightened risk of financial harm due to a fraud or scam.

I have kept in mind the payments were to cryptocurrency providers, but that doesn't mean they should automatically be treated as suspicious, particularly when there are no other concerning factors about the payments.

I do not think the values of payments one to nine were remarkable enough to have caused Revolut any concern. Nor do I consider enough of a pattern formed here to suggest Ms D might be at a heightened risk of financial harm due to fraud or a scam at this stage. The payments were not made in quick succession and were spread out across several days. So, I'm not persuaded Revolut reasonably ought to have been concerned about these payments.

Payment ten of £4,890 was of a value far more significant, was made in the same day as another large payment and was going to a known cryptocurrency provider.

Here I'm satisfied Revolut should have intervened, and I think a proportionate intervention would have been an automated warning. Here though I don't think it would have stopped Ms D making the payment or prevented the scam. I'll explain why.

Revolut did intervene more than once and asked Ms D for a payment purpose and the wider circumstances – it also took her into its online chat function. Given the values and identifiable risk at the time, the interventions were proportionate in the circumstances. It's worth noting that one of the interventions was also on a payment the exact same amount as payment ten and shortly before it. – this payment ended up being cancelled and remade.

Ms D did get the option to select that she was paying towards a job opportunity, but she selected something else. This prevented Revolut from giving her a targeted warning relevant to the scam she was falling victim to. Ms D went on to provide inaccurate responses to the remainder of the questions both the automated system and the advisor asked.

Therefore, due to the reasons I have outlined above, I am not persuaded Revolut ought to have done more and due to this couldn't have prevented Ms D's losses.

As the money was sent to other accounts in Ms D's name, no recovery would be possible. If any money remained in those accounts, she could send it back herself.

Our investigator has also correctly pointed out that our service doesn't have jurisdiction to get involved in the cryptocurrency payments. Having said that, our service also isn't aware of a way to recover these once sent.

I understand that this will have been frustrating for Ms D. But I've thought carefully about everything that has happened, and with all the circumstances of this complaint in mind I don't think Revolut needs to pay Ms D any compensation. I realise this means Ms D is out of pocket and I'm sorry she's lost this money. However, for the reasons I've explained, I don't think I can reasonably uphold this complaint.

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 Ms D to accept or reject my decision before 25 February 2026.

Tom Wagstaff
Ombudsman