

The complaint

Miss A 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.

Miss A complains that she sent several payments to what she thought was a legitimate investment, that later turned out to be a scam.

When Miss A realised she had lost her money, she raised a complaint with Revolut.

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

Our investigator looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. Our investigator didn't think the payments were of a value that would have triggered Revolut's automatic payment checking system. He also didn't think Revolut could have recovered the money.

As Miss A 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 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 focussed 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 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. This simply reflects the informal nature of our service as a free alternative to the courts.

Where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive, or contradictory, I must make my decision on the balance of probabilities – that is, what I consider is more likely than not to have happened in the light of the available evidence and the wider surrounding circumstances.

In line with the Payment Services Regulations (PSR) 2017, consumers are generally liable for payments they authorise. Revolut is expected to process authorised payment instructions without undue delay. As an Electronic Money Institution (EMI), they also have long-standing obligations to help protect customers from financial harm from fraud and scams. However, there are many payments made by customers each day and it's not realistic or reasonable to expect an EMI to stop and check every payment instruction. There's a balance to be struck

between identifying payments that could potentially be fraudulent, and minimising disruption to legitimate payments.

Having considered the size of the individual payments, I'm satisfied they were not of a value or remarkable enough to have triggered Revolut's payment checking process. The payments were also spread across different days.

So, I don't find Revolut did anything wrong when they didn't stop Miss A's payments.

Having said that, Revolut did intervene on some of Miss A's payments and its automated system asked her for the payment purpose and surrounding circumstances. Revolut then provided warnings relevant to the answers Miss A gave. Unfortunately, this didn't prevent her from making the payments and Miss A was being coached at the time on how to answer them. So, I don't find Revolut should have done anything more here.

I understand Miss A has said the scammer used the identity of a legitimate individual, and although this is something I have considered, it hasn't changed the outcome I've reached. Revolut would not have been aware of this information when the payments were being made. And as I don't think the payments ought to have triggered a further intervention, this doesn't impact the outcome I've reached.

Miss A has said she was vulnerable at the time of the scam. I'm sorry to hear of the challenges Miss A is facing. I have thought about this point carefully, but I haven't seen anything to suggest Revolut were aware of any vulnerabilities at the time. I also would not have expected Revolut to intervene on this information alone had they had it, given what I've said about the size and circumstances of the payments.

Recovery

Revolut did attempt to recover the funds from the third-party accounts but got no response from the firms involved. So, I don't find Revolut could have done anything more to recover the money. The scam was also reported some time after the payments were made, so I find it's unlikely any funds remained in the accounts they were paid to. From what we know of scams of this type, the money is generally moved out of the receiving account shortly after it's received.

Miss A feels that Revolut should refund the money she lost due to the scam. I understand that this will have been upsetting for her. 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 Miss A any compensation. I realise this means Miss A is out of pocket and I'm sorry she's lost this money. However, for the reasons I've explained, I don't find 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 Miss A to accept or reject my decision before 20 February 2026.

Tom Wagstaff
Ombudsman