

## **The complaint**

Ms P complains, initially via a representative, that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) have failed to refund the money she lost as part of a fake job scam.

## **What happened**

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties, so I will not repeat everything again here. Instead, I will focus on giving the reasons for my decision.

In summary though, Ms P was contacted via a messaging service by a scammer that I will call C. C persuaded Ms P that they worked for a company that I will call B, that would pay her for completing a series of tasks online. Periodically, while completing these tasks, she was asked to “top up” her account by paying B.

When Ms P attempted to withdraw the “income” that she could see on B’s ‘platform’, she was told that she had to pay an additional fee to clear a negative balance which would allow withdrawals commensurate with the “income” she had earned. At this point Ms P realised that she had been scammed.

Ms P sent over £16,000 in 2024 and 2025 by direct crypto withdrawal to a crypto exchange from her Revolut account. The crypto was then sent on to B.

Ms P asked Revolut to refund the payments she made from her Revolut account, as she believes Revolut should have done more to prevent her from being scammed in the first place. Revolut did not agree with this.

One of our investigators looked into this matter and she did not think that Ms P had sufficiently demonstrated she’d lost money to the scam. She also did not think that Revolut could have prevented the scam with an appropriate and proportionate intervention, given the answers provided by Ms P when it did intervene. She therefore did not uphold this complaint.

Ms P did not agree with this and therefore her complaint has been passed to me to issue a decision.

I note that Revolut initially explained that it did not think we could look at the crypto withdrawals. The investigator explained that, whilst we could not look at them directly, we could consider them in the wider context in relation to the deposits into the crypto wallet. As Revolut did not object to this, I will not be considering this point.

## **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.

In deciding what's fair and reasonable, I am required to take into account relevant law and regulations, regulators' rules, guidance and standards, and codes of practice; and, where appropriate, I must also take into account what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time.

Where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive or contradictory (as some of it is here), I reach my decision on the balance of probabilities – in other words, on what I consider is more likely to have (or would have) happened, in light of the available evidence and the wider circumstances.

In this decision, I'll concentrate my comments on what I think is relevant. If I don't comment on a specific point, it's not because I've failed to consider it, but because I don't think I need to comment in order to reach a fair and reasonable outcome. Our rules allow me to do this and this reflects the nature of our service as a free and informal alternative to the courts.

In broad terms, the starting position is that Revolut is expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make. This should be in accordance with the Payment Services Regulations and the terms and conditions of the customer's account.

However, taking into account relevant law, regulatory rules and guidance, relevant codes of practice and what I consider to have 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 (among other things). 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 – (as in practice Revolut sometimes does); and
- have been mindful of – among other things – common scam scenarios, how the 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.

Firstly, I note that the investigator has said that Ms P has not demonstrated that she lost money to the scam. I do not agree with this, as there is enough to demonstrate that money was sent to the scammer and comments from the various people she was talking to at B that funds were received. This is not true for every single payment. but there is enough for me to be satisfied, albeit on balance, that Ms P lost money to a scam.

That said, I am not going to uphold this complaint because I don't think that Revolut could have prevented or uncovered the scam. Let me explain why.

In this instance, Ms P's account was newly opened. So it didn't know what an unusual transaction would look like for Ms P. But I think that Revolut should have intervened during some of the crypto exchanges, to find out what they related to. However, I don't think that this would have stopped the scam.

I say this because I can see that Revolut did intervene a few times during the crypto withdrawals. When asked questions about the scam during these interventions, Ms P provided answers that were not accurate. She never indicated that she was making these payments as part of a job opportunity. This prevented Revolut in providing a warning that related to a job scam. So, I think that Ms P's choice of payment option meant that Revolut would never have been able to provide a relevant warning.

I am also mindful that Ms P did give inaccurate answers to other questions asked, such as her saying that she was sending funds to friends and family to repay debts and that the company she was sending funds to was FCA registered.

So taking everything into consideration, I don't think that Revolut could have stopped the scam with a proportional intervention.

I've also thought about whether Revolut could have done more to recover the funds after Ms P reported the fraud.

Revolut are under no obligation to refund the money to Ms P under any of the reimbursement schemes as crypto withdrawals are not covered. I also do not think that Revolut could have recovered the funds from the crypto exchange because they had already been sent on to B.

I appreciate this will likely come as a disappointment to Ms P, and I'm sorry to hear she has been the victim of a scam. However, I'm not persuaded that Revolut can fairly or reasonably be held liable for her apparent loss in these circumstances.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons given above, I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Ms P to accept or reject my decision before 9 April 2026.

Charlie Newton  
**Ombudsman**