

The complaint

Miss C 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 C complains that she sent several payments to what she thought was a legitimate task-based job.

When Miss C realised she had been scammed, she raised a complaint with Revolut.

Revolut looked into the complaint but didn't uphold it. So, Miss C 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've triggered Revolut's automatic payment checking system. He also found Revolut did give Miss C a relevant scam warning when she sent the second of the larger payments, but she sent the money anyway.

Miss C did make some smaller payments towards the scam before the two larger ones she's now complaining about. Revolut have confirmed that Miss C received credits that totalled more than she sent.. So, I haven't looked into these as part of Miss C's loss.

As Miss C 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.

Our investigator has explained in their view what we can and can't look into as a service in relation to cryptocurrency payments. I agree with what the investigator has said and it doesn't appear either party is disputing this, so I won't cover this in detail again.

Having considered the size of the individual exchanges, I'm satisfied they were not of a value or remarkable enough to have required Revolut to intervene.

Having said that, Revolut did intervene on one of the cryptocurrency withdrawals Miss C made. Although our service is unable to comment on this type of transaction, as we don't have jurisdiction to do so and can only look at the exchanges, it does satisfy me that if Revolut had given the warning on the exchange instead, Miss C would have still moved passed it. I've based this finding on how closely together the exchange was to the withdrawal.

The intervention Revolut gave Miss C also displayed warnings relating to a job scam. I've seen these warnings and they were relevant to the scam Miss C was falling victim to, but she decided to make the payment anyway.

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

Recovery

The two payments Miss C has complained about were sent as cryptocurrency. As this isn't something our service has jurisdiction to look into, I can't comment on any recovery attempts made by Revolut.

It's worth noting that as far as our service is aware, cryptocurrency payments can't be recovered.

Miss C 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 C any compensation. I realise this means Miss C 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 C to accept or reject my decision before 16 March 2026.

Tom Wagstaff
Ombudsman