

The complaint

Miss G is unhappy that Monzo Bank Ltd won't refund money she lost as a result of a scam.

What happened

- Miss G was a victim of a scam involving a £2,040.00 international payment to an individual.
- She disputed the transaction and raised a complaint with Monzo about what happened. It declined to refund her and largely didn't uphold her complaint, considering it came to the right decision on her fraud claim. But it paid £30 to reflect administration errors in how it handled the complaint.
- Unhappy with the outcome, Miss G brought the matter to our service to investigate. Our investigator considered that Monzo acted fairly. Miss G requested an ombudsman's decision. In summary, she said:
 - She wasn't provided with a warning
 - Monzo's reason for declining the matter was different to our investigator
 - Monzo ought to have spotted red flags with the payment, and it's incorrect to say the payment was low value
 - £30 isn't adequate compensation to reflect what happened

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 for these reasons:

- It's not disputed that Miss G was the victim of a scam. There are distressing experiences, and I'm sorry to hear about what she's been through. My role is to consider whether it's fair to hold Monzo, as her bank, responsible for her losses from the scam. There are various rules and codes that mean victims of scams ought to be refunded in some circumstances. But to be clear, there isn't an overarching, general expectation that banks ought to refund victims of scams.
- Miss G's referenced the Contingent Reimbursement Model (CRM), a voluntary code which Monzo acted in the spirit of. This was succeeded by the APP scam reimbursement rules. But given this disputed payment was international, the new rules don't apply here, nor would the previous CRM Code.
- That means the starting position in law is that Miss G is responsible for this payment she authorised. However, Monzo is aware, taking longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements into account, and what I consider to be good industry practice at the time, that it should have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and made additional checks before processing payments in some

circumstances.

- This was a single payment for £2,040.00. I accept that's a lot for anyone to lose to fraud, but I'm mindful of the volume of payments a bank like Monzo processes of this size and the impracticalities of stopping every payment like it. And I've noted Miss G had made similarly sized payments before.
- The payment went to a new payee, overseas. But there are many legitimate reasons people pay new individuals abroad – indeed, Miss G had made international payments before. So I don't think this ought to have alerted Monzo that something was amiss.
- Miss G said Monzo ought to have been concerned that the payment wasn't going to a regulated investment and it was connected to cryptocurrency. But Monzo wouldn't have known what the payment was ultimately for from the details given – instead, it appeared as a payment to an individual.
- Taking this all into account, I don't find Monzo acted unreasonably in processing this payment without completing further checks. After all, it must balance protecting her from fraud with its legal obligation to make the payment she tells it to.
- As well as whether Monzo ought to have prevented her losses, I've considered whether it could have done more to recover them. I've noted that when it heard back from the firm that received Miss G's money, there wasn't anything left to recover. I've considered if Monzo could've requested this sooner, but given this was an international transfer, and the speed in which fraudsters typically move on money, I don't think this would've made a difference.
- I've noted the £30 compensation for administrative failings in its complaint handling. I accept it doesn't make up for her scam losses, but to be clear, this is solely for the impact of these particular failings. And I don't think it's materially affected the overall outcome to her complaint and the driving force of her upset and disappointment.
- I've finally considered Miss G's reference to other ombudsmen decisions. But each case is decided on its own merits, carefully looking at the individual circumstances of the matter, which I'm satisfied I've done here.
- I appreciate this will be disappointing news for Miss G, particularly as she's ultimately a victim in this situation. But for the reasons I've explained, I don't think I can reasonably tell Monzo to refund her losses.

My final decision

For the reasons I've explained, I don't uphold Miss G's complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss G to accept or reject my decision before 27 January 2026.

Emma Szkolar
Ombudsman