

The complaint

Mr H has complained Revolut Ltd lodged a fraud-related marker on the industry fraud database, CIFAS, in his name.

What happened

Mr H had opened an account with Revolut in March 2024. He discovered in 2025 that as well as closing his account, Revolut had lodged a fraud-related marker on the industry fraud database, CIFAS, in his name. He complained to them and asked them to remove the marker. Revolut believed they had sufficient evidence to lodge a CIFAS marker.

Mr H brought his complaint to the ombudsman service.

Our investigator noted the evidence Revolut had shared with our service. This showed a fraud report received by another bank about five payments totalling £3,045.66 that credited Mr H's Revolut account on 6 July 2025.

Mr H told her that he'd allowed a friend of a friend to make payments into his account as he was helping him to buy cryptocurrency. He was unable to provide any evidence to support this. Our investigator wouldn't agree to ask Revolut to remove the CIFAS marker.

Still unhappy, Mr H has asked an ombudsman to consider his complaint.

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 outcome as our investigator. I'll explain why.

It is clear what the requirements are prior to lodging a marker. Specifically:

“There must be reasonable grounds to believe that an identified fraud or financial crime has been committed or attempted.

The evidence must be clear, relevant and rigorous.”

Revolut must be able to provide clear evidence that an identified fraud was being committed, and Mr H was involved. This means that they must have more than a suspicion or a concern that Mr H may be involved.

There's also a requirement that Revolut should be giving the account holder an opportunity to explain what was going on.

I've seen the evidence provided by Revolut. This confirms they received a fraud notification from another bank that one of their customers had sent five payments to Mr H and these payments totalled £3,045.66.

Not all of Revolut's evidence is complete. Mr H's statement from Revolut shows five credits to his account on 6 July 2025 from another of his accounts. These were for £500, £646.87, £600, £550 and £450 so totals £2,746.07. This total was swiftly converted to cryptocurrency.

As Revolut didn't share statements from Mr H's Revolut savings account, I can't see what payments were received from the bank whose fraud report I've seen.

That said Mr H hasn't disputed that this money isn't his. He said it was from a friend of a friend, whose name he didn't know. I appreciate Mr H is still young, but I find it inconceivable that he was paid more than £3,000 by someone whose name he didn't even know and then was willing to invest it in cryptocurrency on his behalf.

There is no correspondence to back up this financial arrangement. What Mr H has shared is a series of messages with a third party who he's trying to persuade to act on his behalf with Revolut to confirm that this is all above board. This third party is very clearly not willing to play ball.

Mr H has told us he's not made any financial gain, but this isn't the case. At a minimum Mr H received just under £300 from this supposed friend's friend. Although I appreciate Revolut closed Mr H's account and sent back any remaining funds to the bank that submitted the original fraud claim, there was certainly £300 (so about 10% of the funds received) that I believe Mr H was paid for making this crypto purchase.

I'm satisfied that Mr H benefitted from funds that were fraudulent. But did he know that this was fraud? I point again to the fact that Mr H was willing to accept funds from someone he didn't know and invest them in crypto. This isn't normal behaviour for someone of Mr H's age whilst apparently studying as a student.

I've not seen evidence from Mr H to demonstrate anything to the contrary.

I'm satisfied Revolut had enough evidence to lodge the CIFAS marker. On this basis, I won't be asking Revolut to remove the CIFAS marker.

My final decision

For the reasons given, my final decision is not to uphold Mr H's complaint against Revolut Ltd.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr H to accept or reject my decision before 5 February 2026.

Sandra Quinn
Ombudsman