

The complaint and background

Mr A complains that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) didn’t do enough to protect him when he fell victim to scam, requiring him to complete ‘engagement tasks’. This resulted in the loss of over £5,000.

Our investigator considered the complaint. She concluded that our Service has the jurisdiction to consider the aspects of the complaint which ultimately led to the loss Mr A suffered. And, in doing so, she thought that Revolut should have intervened at the point of the fourth exchange of funds to cryptocurrency. But that, if it had done so, this wouldn’t have prevented Mr A’s losses. This was because it had intervened earlier on, and Mr A had provided inaccurate answers and ultimately chose to proceed with the exchanges and subsequent withdrawals.

Mr A disagreed. He provided a detailed response but, in summary, he felt Revolut should have intervened as the payments he was making escalated; he didn’t feel it was fair to say that Revolut should have intervened but that this wouldn’t have prevented his loss; and he didn’t think the warnings presented were effective. So 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.

Having taken into account longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements, and what I consider to be good industry practice, I agree Revolut ought to have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and made additional checks before processing payments in some circumstances.

I agree with the investigator that Revolut should have intervened at the point of the fourth exchange. But to uphold this complaint, I would need to be persuaded that if it had done so, this would *more likely than not* have prevented Mr A’s loss. And I’m not persuaded that a proportionate intervention at this point would have prevented his loss.

I say this because Revolut did intervene, by way of an automated process, when Mr A was making cryptocurrency withdrawals prior to the fourth exchange. Mr A provided responses to reflect that he understood that investments promoted on social media are almost always scams, being pressured into making payments means he was likely being scammed, being offered high returns from an investment over a short period of time means he was likely being scammed and that if he’s sending money to an account he doesn’t control as part of an investment he was likely being scammed. In addition to this, he selected the option to say that he’d heard about the opportunity from a friend or family member, wasn’t following any sort of instructions and had researched the company. He provided these answers on two occasions.

While the questions were in relation to investments, as opposed to specifically being about employment-related matters, it stands that Mr A provided a series of inaccurate answers

which didn't reflect what was happening. Mr A accepts that he didn't answer accurately but said this was due to the grooming of the scammer, which is typical of this kind of situation. While I appreciate that to have been the case, I have to consider the actions that Revolut took here – it asked Mr A a series of questions to determine whether he was at risk of financial harm and, based on the answers he provided, it wasn't concerned enough to take further action. It was prevented from providing relevant warnings as it wasn't given accurate responses to the questions posed. Based on the amounts involved and the answers Mr A provided, I wouldn't have expected the intervention to go beyond the automated process.

And, as Mr A was being coached by the scammer to make payments towards what he believed to be a legitimate situation, I'm not satisfied that if Revolut had intervened at the time of the fourth exchange, it would have led to a different outcome. Instead, I'm persuaded that Mr A would have continued to answer in such a way that avoided alerting Revolut to what was really happening, under the guidance of the scammer.

While Mr A has been the victim of a cruel scam, and I'm sorry to learn about the impact this has had on him, I can only uphold this complaint if I'm satisfied that Revolut's failings made a material difference to what happened. For the reasons given, I'm not persuaded they did.

My final decision

For the reasons given above, my final decision is that I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr A to accept or reject my decision before 12 March 2026.

Melanie van der Waals
Ombudsman