

The complaint

Miss M says Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) failed to protect her from financial harm when she fell victim to a scam.

What happened

The facts of this complaint are well known to both parties, so I won’t repeat them in detail here.

In short, Miss M says she was contacted out of the blue by an unknown number via iMessage offering an opportunity to make money online. Miss M was then added to a WhatsApp chat with others who she believed were also working with the company. The job involved her completing simple tasks online via social media platforms in exchange for commission. There were also penalties and fees to pay if any mistakes were made on the job. Miss M says she paid a lot of money into this scam and only received £5 in commission payments. Miss M says she believed this was a genuine opportunity and only realised she was being scammed when her other bank called her to discuss a payment and the type of scam she had fallen victim to. But Miss M says Revolut didn’t do anything to protect her or her money and it should refund the money she lost to this scam.

The payments Miss M says she made from her Revolut account as part of this scam are as follows:

Payment Number	Date	Time	Method	Amount
1	24/03/2025	10.22	Card Payment	£500.00
2	24/03/2025	10.23	Card Payment	£500.00
3	24/03/2025	10.28	Card Payment	£890.00
4	24/03/2025	10.29	Card Payment	£890.00
5	24/03/2025	10.31	Card Payment	£900.00
6	24/03/2025	12.33	Card Payment	£1,000.00
7	24/03/2025	12.35	Card Payment	£1,000.00
8	24/03/2025	12.36	Card Payment	£1,000.00
9	24/03/2025	12.38	Card Payment	£1,000.00
10	24/03/2025	12.40	Card Payment	£1,000.00
11	24/03/2025	12.43	Card Payment	£1,000.00

Revolut considered her complaint but decided not to uphold it. It felt that it had asked

probing questions and provided relevant written warnings regarding scams in general and cryptocurrency scams. But ultimately, Miss M didn't answer the questions honestly and made the transactions despite its warnings. It also highlighted that the cryptocurrency withdrawal made on 24 March 2025 was not in our jurisdiction to consider as this is not a regulated activity.

Our investigator considered this complaint and decided not to uphold it. She felt that the transactions were authorised as per the relevant Payment Services Regulations (PSRs) and agreed that the cryptocurrency withdrawal was not in our jurisdiction to consider - but the rest of the complaint was. She also looked at the payments made to the scammer and made the finding that Revolut ought to have intervened at Payment 5, but in any event, she was not persuaded this would've made a difference to Miss M's loss. Miss M wasn't happy with this outcome, so the complaint has been passed to me for a final 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.

Before I set out my thoughts, I want to acknowledge that I have summarised this complaint briefly and, in less detail, than has been provided. I've focused on what I think is the heart of the matter. Please rest assured that while I may not comment on every point raised, I have considered it. I'm satisfied that 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 and reflect the fact that we are an informal service and a free alternative for consumers to the courts.

I'd also like to say that I am extremely sorry to learn that Miss M was deceived into sending money to these scammers. Scams such as the one Miss M fell victim to are sophisticated scams, usually with many people involved and a great deal of time and effort is spent on convincing their victims that the opportunities presented are genuine. So, I can understand if Miss M feels frustrated and upset by what happened. In my role I have considered everything both parties have told me to come to a decision which is fair and reasonable to both parties. I cannot punish financial providers for any wrong doings, and I cannot instruct them to change their products or processes.

Revolut disputed us considering the cryptocurrency withdrawal on 24 March 2025, and our investigator agreed that this transaction was not a regulated activity. Miss M didn't dispute this further, so I have not made any further findings on this matter, and I have considered the transactions in the above table.

Generally speaking, ██████ should be held liable for any unauthorised payments made from Miss M's account, and Miss M liable for authorised payments. Those rules are set out in the Payment Service Regulations 2017. Initially Miss M complained that the above transactions were unauthorised and so Revolut should refund them. But she now says she didn't fully understand what authorised and unauthorised meant in this context and she says she did authorise these payments but did so under false pretences. The PSR's outline that when authorising a transaction, it is irrelevant whether the payment service user is aware of the full details of the transaction and/or whether the payments were made under duress. The transactions will be classified as authorised if they followed the form and procedure for making a payment, and consent was given at the time. So, what Miss M says about being deceived, does not make these transactions unauthorised.

When considering complaints where a customer has fallen victim to a scam, the starting position at law is that an Electronic Money Institution ("EMI") such as Revolut is expected to

process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make, in accordance with the Payment Services Regulations and the terms and conditions of the customer's account.

But, taking into account relevant law, regulators' rules and guidance, relevant codes of practice and what I consider having been good industry practice at the time, I consider it fair and reasonable that Revolut should:

- have been monitoring accounts and any payments made or received to counter various risks, including 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. This is particularly so given the increase in sophisticated fraud and scams in recent years, which firms are generally more familiar with than the average customer;
- have acted to avoid causing foreseeable harm to customers, for example by maintaining adequate systems to detect and prevent scams and by ensuring all aspects of its products, including the contractual terms, enabled it to do so;
- in some circumstances, irrespective of the payment channel used, have taken additional steps, or made additional checks, or provided additional warnings, before processing a payment;
- have been mindful of – among other things – common scam scenarios, how fraudulent practices are evolving (including for example the common use of multi-stage fraud by scammers, including the use of payments to cryptocurrency accounts as a step to defraud consumers) and the different risks these can present to consumers, when deciding whether to intervene.

As can be seen in the table above, Miss M made eleven transactions to this scam all in the same day within a few hours. As for the initial payments, these were all relatively low in value and as this was a newly opened account there was no way for Revolut to conclude these payments were out of character for her usual activity. So, I think it's fair to say that it is reasonable that the first four payments didn't flag as suspicious.

By Payment 5 Miss M had already made four payments within minutes of each other to the same merchant and at Payment five the total amount being sent was at £3,680. There was clearly a pattern quickly emerging here and the payment amounts had started to increase. So, I think Revolut ought to have intervened at this point. The investigator felt that a human intervention would've been appropriate at this time. However, I consider that a tailored written warning regarding the risks of sending money to someone via cryptocurrency would've been the appropriate time of warning. But in any event, this doesn't change the outcome of my decision and I'll explain why.

Revolut has provided evidence that Miss M attempted to make a transaction at 8.28 on the morning of 24 March 2025 to the same merchant as later but this was blocked by Revolut, and it provided her with a written scam warning and urged her to reconsider the payment. I've seen that Revolut also send a message to her app saying that "We've identified a possible scam and blocked all card payments to 'Cro'. Tap to unblock". However, Miss M continued to try and make payments to the same merchant which were blocked by Revolut until she answered some questions about the payments she was trying to make.

Revolut has provided evidence of the information she would've seen at the time. This shows that she would've seen a message saying she should not ignore the following warnings and should answer the questions truthfully. Miss M did not answer the questions it proceeded to ask truthfully. She was asked if she was told to download any software and how she had found the opportunity to invest. She said she had not downloaded any software and had found this opportunity through friends and family. But she told us that she was asked to

download some software and was messaged out of the blue by an unknown number. So, I think even if Revolut had spoken to her over chat, she would've given similar answers which would've reassured Revolut that Miss M was not at risk of financial harm.

Miss M, by her own admission, says she thought she had done her due diligence and the scammers made everything seem very convincing. She says the scammers had prepared her for warnings and blocks by her banks. She says she was told to tell the banks she was sending money to family abroad and she didn't think there was anything wrong with this at the time. So, I think Miss M was being manipulated by the scammers and wasn't able to think clearly about what was happening. As a result, she provided false information to Revolut, and I am persuaded that she would've done the same thing had they spoken to her over chat. So, I don't think it's fair to say Revolut should've uncovered the scam and I've seen that Miss M had been ignoring all written warnings from Revolut and her other bank.

Miss M says her other bank called her to discuss the payments, and as a result of that conversation she realised she had been scammed. And she thinks Revolut ought to have called her to discuss these payments as well. However, Revolut is an online bank, and it often contacts its customers via the app or its chat function. As I've outlined at the start of this decision, I am not in a position to instruct banks or businesses to change its processes, so I can't say Revolut ought to have called her in any event.

So, while it is difficult to say what would have happened in different circumstances, I think it is clear that Revolut did provide some warnings and Miss M didn't take any note of these. I see Miss M's argument that Revolut ought to have done more, but Revolut also has a duty to process Miss M's transactions as instructed and without undue delay. The evidence I've seen persuades me that even if Revolut had done more at Payment 5 (the point at which I think it should have intervened) or indeed again later on, I think Miss M would've lied and provided answers given to her by the scammers which would have prevented Revolut from uncovering this scam.

I've seen that Revolut made attempts to recover the money Miss M lost via chargebacks, but these were unsuccessful. I've also seen that the investigator considered the service Miss M received from Revolut but didn't feel that it had done anything to warrant any compensation. Miss M hasn't provided any further evidence after the initial outcome which persuades me to come to a different finding on these points. So, there is nothing further I think Revolut ought to do here.

I know Miss M will not be happy with the outcome here. As above, I understand her anger and frustration in this matter but ultimately, I don't think Revolut should be held liable for the money she lost to a scam as I don't think it has done anything wrong.

My final decision

I am not upholding this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss M to accept or reject my decision before 6 March 2026.

Sienna Mahboobani
Ombudsman