

The complaint

Mr H is unhappy that Revolut Ltd (Revolut) won't reimburse money he lost to a scam.

What happened

The details of this complaint are well known to both parties, so I won't repeat everything here. In summary, Mr H has advised he made payments from his Revolut account in August and September 2025 which he ultimately lost to an investment scam. He sent the funds to another banking provider and a cryptocurrency provider. He then sent them into the control of the scammers. Mr H has said he lost a total of £2,200 from his Revolut account as a result of the scam.

Mr H raised a complaint with Revolut. It investigated the complaint but didn't uphold it. It didn't think it had done anything wrong by allowing the payments to go through. So, Mr H brought his complaint to our service.

Our Investigator looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. Mr H remained unhappy, so the complaint has been passed to me for a review and 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.

I'm sorry Mr H has been the victim of a scam and lost money as a result of it. And I don't underestimate the impact this has had on him. But while I know this will come as a disappointment to Mr H, for similar reasons as our Investigator, I don't think Revolut has acted unfairly by not refunding his loss. I'll explain why.

I'm 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 heart of the matter here. If there's something I have not mentioned, it isn't because I have 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.

I have thought about the mandatory reimbursement scheme introduced by the Payment Systems Regulator which came into force in October 2024. However, this scheme doesn't cover payments sent to an account held by the customer. I've therefore considered whether Revolut should reimburse Mr H under any of its other obligations.

In broad terms, the starting position at law is that an Electronic Money Institution such as Revolut is expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make, in accordance with the Payment Services Regulations (in this case the 2017 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 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;
- have been mindful of – among other things – common scam scenarios, how the fraudulent practices are evolving and the different risks these can present to consumers, when deciding whether to intervene.

Taking the above into consideration, I need to decide whether Revolut acted fairly and reasonably in its dealings with Mr H when these transactions were made, or whether it should have done more than it did.

The account was opened just before the scam so there was limited account activity prior to the transactions in question, so it is difficult for me to agree that Revolut should have identified the transactions as unusual for Mr H. It's not unusual for a customer to deposit funds into an account and use them straight away, so I don't think this would have put Revolut on notice that Mr H was falling victim to a scam.

The payments made towards the scam were fairly modest. They did not increase significantly in value, and they weren't made in quick succession (which can sometimes indicate a customer is falling victim to a scam). I appreciate that the payments may have represented a lot of money to Mr H, but they were simply not of a value where I'd usually expect Revolut to be concerned that Mr H was at a heightened risk of financial harm. Revolut provided Mr H with a 'new payee' warning when sending some of the payments. This highlighted some of the possible risks of sending the funds and given the size of the payments and what Revolut knew about them, I think this was fair and proportionate in the circumstances.

Some of the payments were made to a bank account in Mr H's name, and although Revolut should, at the time, have been aware of the risk of multi-stage fraud such as Mr H was experiencing, I consider it reasonable that Revolut might have taken some reassurance from this fact in the circumstances. The other payments were being made to a legitimate cryptocurrency provider and while there are known fraud risks associated with cryptocurrency, as scams like this have unfortunately become more prevalent, not all payments related to cryptocurrency are scam related. This means that I wouldn't expect Revolut to intervene on a payment just because it related to cryptocurrency.

I've kept in mind that firms such as Revolut process high volumes of transactions each day. There is a balance for Revolut to find between allowing customers to be able to use their

accounts and questioning transactions to confirm they're legitimate. And taking all the circumstances into account here, I don't think it was unreasonable for Revolut not to view the payments as suspicious, such that it should have carried out any additional checks or given an additional warning before processing the payments. So, I've not found that Revolut ought to have done any more to prevent the scam payments Mr H made.

I have also considered whether Revolut could have done anything to recover Mr H's payments once the scam was uncovered, However, the funds were converted into cryptocurrency and paid to the scammer. Therefore, I don't think there was any realistic possibility of recovery.

Mr H has advised he was vulnerable at the time these payments were made. But I've not seen anything to show that Revolut was aware, or ought to have been aware of this at the time of the disputed payments, and I'm not persuaded it should reasonably have done anything differently.

I know this outcome will be disappointing for Mr H and I'm sorry for that. But it would only be fair for me to direct Revolut to refund his loss if I thought it was responsible – and I'm not persuaded that this was the case. For the above reasons, I think Revolut has acted fairly and so I'm not going to tell it to do anything further.

My final decision

For the reasons I've explained, I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr H to accept or reject my decision before 8 May 2026.

Aleya Khanom
Ombudsman